

DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

1/s



CLOSED
STACKS

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

REFERENCE
BOOK


Not to be taken from the Library
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEC 1 2 1995

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1223 03476 7286



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

<http://archive.org/details/14minutesofsanfran1970sa>

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 2, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 2, 1970, at 1:45 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Walter S. Newman, Vice President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning; Patricia Peterson, Planner II; John Sanger, Planner II; Allan Lubliner, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Lena Baker represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Cantor represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, introduced John Sanger, a newly-employed Planner II.

The Director reported that he had met with representatives of the Department of Public Works regarding the recommendations which he had formulated for alternate routes and design criteria for any freeway which might be constructed to link the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges. He stated that the Department of Public Works and the Department of City Planning are in complete agreement regarding the recommendations.

The Director advised the Commission that he had attended a meeting in the Haight-Ashbury District to discuss possible expansion of the FACE area proposed for that neighborhood. The people who had attended the meeting were favorable to the proposal, and the Director thus intended to recommend expansion of that FACE area instead of undertaking another FACE project in the Sunnyside neighborhood.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 2, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 2, 1970, at 1:45 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Walter S. Newman, Vice President; James L. Finn, Mortimer Felschack, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles E. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning; Patricia Peterson, Planner II; John Sanger, Planner II; Allan Luchner, Planner I; and Lynn E. Rio, Secretary.

Lena Baker represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Cantor represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, introduced John Sanger, a newly employed Planner II.

The Director reported that he had met with representatives of the Department of Public Works regarding the recommendations which he had formulated for alternate routes and design criteria for any freeway which might be constructed to link the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges. He stated that the Department of Public Works and the Department of City Planning are in complete agreement regarding the recommendations.

The Director advised the Commission that he had attended a meeting in the Haight-Ashbury District to discuss possible expansion of the FACE area proposed for that neighborhood. The people who had attended the meeting were favorable to the proposal, and the Director thus intended to recommend expansion of that FACE area instead of undertaking another FACE project in the Sunnyside neighborhood.

7/2/70

The Director informed the Commission that word had been received from the Federal Department of Transportation that a \$371,000 Urban Mass Transportation Technical Studies Grant for the San Francisco Airport Access Project has been approved. This grant will represent 2/3 Federal funding of the study to be undertaken jointly by San Francisco County, San Mateo County and BART for extending the BART system from Daly City to the San Francisco International Airport. Contract negotiations are underway with prospective consultants and it is expected that the 12 month detailed engineering and financial study will commence in the near future.

The Director requested that the Plan Implementation Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker and Porter) meet with the staff next Friday, July 10, at 2:00 p.m.

The Director announced that Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV, had retired from service with the City. It was subsequently moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6557 be adopted commending Miss Brown on her vast contributions to the Department of City Planning and the City and County of San Francisco and wishing for her great enjoyment during her retirement.

CU70.48 1130-1150 Sacramento Street, 132-138 Sproule Lane, and 135-145 Mason Street.

Request for a 28-story hotel, containing approximately 346 guest rooms, two penthouse apartments, dining room, lobby, and a 3-level automobile parking garage in R-3 and R-4 District, (Under advisement from meeting of June 18, 1970)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), noted that the subject application had been taken under advisement from the meeting of June 18, 1970, to allow residents of the neighborhood to review plans for the proposed facility; however, to his knowledge, no one had come to the Department of City Planning to review the plans which were on file. During the interim, the applicant had submitted additional traffic information which had resulted from an updating of the traffic study which had been made of the hotel building previously approved by the Commission.

Robert Patmont, representing the applicant, emphasized that the issue before the Commission did not involve the question of whether any hotel should be constructed on the property since that question had previously been resolved when the Commission voted to allow construction of a 270-room hotel on the site in 1968. The issue now before the Commission concerned what type of hotel would be constructed on the site. He displayed photographs which had been taken of the subject site and adjacent parcels of property with renderings of the original and revised plans for the hotel superimposed; and he indicated that he genuinely felt that the revised plans would provide a building which would be infinitely better both for the subject neighborhood and

The Director informed the Commission that word had been received from the Federal Department of Transportation that a \$371,000 Urban Transportation Technical Studies Grant for the San Francisco Airport Access Project has been approved. This grant will represent 2/3 Federal funding of the study to be undertaken jointly by San Francisco County, San Mateo County and BART for extending the BART system from Daly City to the San Francisco International Airport. Contract negotiations are underway with prospective consultants and it is expected that the 12 month detailed engineering and financial study will commence in the near future.

The Director requested that the Plan Implementation Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Finn, Fleishacker and Porter) meet with the staff next Friday, July 10, at 2:00 p.m.

The Director announced that Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV, had retired from service with the City. It was subsequently moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6327 be adopted commending Miss Brown on her vast contributions to the Department of City Planning and the City and County of San Francisco and wishing for her great enjoyment during her retirement.

CITY 48 1130-1150 Sacramento Street, 132-138 Sprout Lane, and 132-142 Mason Street.

Request for a 38-story hotel, containing approximately 340 guest rooms; two penthouse apartments; dining room; lobby; and a 3-level automobile parking garage in R-3 and R-4 District. (Under advisement from meeting of June 18, 1970)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), noted that the subject application had been taken under advisement from the meeting of June 18, 1970, to allow residents of the neighborhood to review plans for the proposed facility; however, to his knowledge, no one had come to the Department of City Planning to review the plans which were on file. During the interim, the applicant had submitted additional traffic information which had resulted from an updating of the traffic study which had been made of the hotel building previously approved by the Commission.

Robert Patmont, representing the applicant, emphasized that the issue before the Commission did not involve the question of whether any hotel should be constructed on the property since that question had previously been resolved when the Commission voted to allow construction of a 270-room hotel on the site in 1968. The issue now before the Commission concerned what type of hotel would be constructed on the site. He displayed photographs which had been taken of the subject site and adjacent parcels of property with renderings of the original and revised plans for the hotel superimposed; and he indicated that he genuinely felt that the revised plans would provide a building which would be infinitely better both for the subject neighborhood and

7/2/70

for San Francisco as a whole. If the revised plans were approved, a hotel comparable to the Regency in New York could be constructed; if not, a hotel of lesser dignity would be constructed on the site. He stated that all residents of the subject neighborhood with whom he had met had agreed that the revised plans for the hotel would be infinitely better than the plans which had previously been submitted to the Commission; and he indicated that the Nob Hill Association had supported the subject application.

Mr. Patmont advised the Commission that the traffic study of the original hotel proposal which had been prepared by De Leuw Cather had been updated. The consultants had concluded that existing traffic patterns in the subject neighborhood had not changed substantially since completion of the earlier traffic study; however, it was their opinion that the revised plans for the hotel would create a far better traffic situation than the original plans since all service vehicles and many private vehicles would enter and leave the hotel by way of Mason Street, thus lessening the amount of traffic on Sproule Lane. The consultant's report also noted that the peak traffic hour for hotels is at 2:00 in the afternoon; and, as a result, the hotel traffic would not interfere with the City's evening rush hour traffic.

Mr. Patmont advised the Commission that the applicant's 99-year lease on the subject property has a penalty clause; and, as a result, he hoped that the Commission would either approve or disapprove the revised plans for the proposed hotel during the present meeting. If the revised plans were to be disapproved, he doubted that his clients would be responsible for developing a hotel in accordance with the plans which had already been approved since such a hotel would not meet their standards of quality.

Ted Moulton, representing the Nob Hill Association, stated that the applicants had met all of the objections which his organization had raised concerning the original hotel proposal. The new hotel would provide a sizable amount of open space and would have a better traffic pattern than the hotel which had previously been approved by the Commission; and, as a result, he and the members of his organization hoped that the revised plans would be approved.

Arnold Browning, owner of property located on the southwest corner of Mason and Clay Streets, assumed that the character of Malvina Place would be changed because of the fact that both the automobiles parking in the 90-car garage and the service vehicles coming to the hotel would exit on Malvina Place. He believed that Malvina Place would ultimately become a one-way street serving only the hotel. At the same time, the traffic load on Malvina Place would probably be increased from approximately four vehicles a day to one or two hundred vehicles a day including trucks; and all of those vehicles would stop at the corner of Mason Street which is located only 10 feet from his apartment building. The fumes and noise produced by those vehicles would be unpleasant; and Malvina Place would no longer exist for the benefit of properties which front on it. Under these circumstances, he did not believe

for San Francisco as a whole. If the revised plans were approved, a hotel comparable to the Regency in New York could be constructed; if not, a hotel of lesser dignity would be constructed on the site. He stated that all representatives of the subject neighborhood with whom he had met had agreed that the revised plans for the hotel would be infinitely better than the plans which had previously been submitted to the Commission; and he indicated that the Nob Hill Association had supported the subject application.

Mr. Batmont advised the Commission that the traffic study of the original hotel proposal which had been prepared by De Leon Cather had been updated. The consultant had concluded that existing traffic patterns in the subject neighborhood had not changed substantially since completion of the earlier traffic study; however, it was their opinion that the revised plans for the hotel would create a far better traffic situation than the original plans since all service vehicles and many private vehicles would enter and leave the hotel by way of Mason Street, thus lessening the amount of traffic on Spruce Lane. The consultant's report also noted that the peak traffic hour for hotels is at 3:00 in the afternoon; and, as a result, the hotel traffic would not interfere with the City's evening rush hour traffic.

Mr. Batmont advised the Commission that the applicant's 99-year lease on the subject property has a penalty clause; and, as a result, he hoped that the Commission would either approve or disapprove the revised plans for the proposed hotel during the present meeting. If the revised plans were to be disapproved, he doubted that his clients would be responsible for developing a hotel in accordance with the plans which had already been approved since such a hotel would not meet their standards of quality.

Ted Moulton, representing the Nob Hill Association, stated that the applicant had met all of the objections which his organization had raised concerning the original hotel proposal. The new hotel would provide a sizable amount of open space and would have a better traffic pattern than the hotel which had previously been approved by the Commission; and, as a result, he and the members of his organization hoped that the revised plans would be approved.

Arnold Browning, owner of property located on the southwest corner of Mason and Clay Streets, assumed that the character of Malvina Place would be changed because of the fact that both the automobiles parking in the 90-car garage and the service vehicles coming to the hotel would exit on Malvina Place. He believed that Malvina Place would ultimately become a one-way street serving only the hotel. At the same time, the traffic load on Malvina Place would probably be increased from approximately four vehicles a day to one or two hundred vehicles a day including trucks, and all of those vehicles would stop at the corner of Mason Street which is located only 10 feet from his apartment building. The fumes and noise produced by those vehicles would be unpleasant; and Malvina Place would no longer exist for the benefit of properties which front on it. Under these circumstances, he did not believe

7/2/70

that the revised plans would provide a more favorable traffic situation. Since he had not seen any plans for construction of an apartment building on the portion of the subject site fronting on Malvina Place, he did not know how such a building would affect the character of the street.

Richard Bancroft, attorney for Stanley Herzstein, owner of a condominium apartment in the Nob Hill apartment building, remarked that his client's penthouse apartment would lose its view if the proposed hotel were to be constructed. Nevertheless, he felt that the proposed hotel could be of high quality and could render a service to San Francisco. Mr. Bancroft remarked that he had previously raised an objection regarding the notice which had been sent by the Department of City Planning regarding the subject proposal since the notice had not expressed all of the changes being contemplated in the proposed hotel which might have been of interest to residents of the area; and, in fact, even the plans which were presently before the City Planning Commission left some doubt as to the actual location of the northerly line of the proposed hotel owner. However, he regarded that concern as being secondary to the traffic flow problems which would obviously develop if the revised plans were to be approved as proposed. He noted that vehicles arriving at the front of the hotel would be able to turn onto Sproule Lane either from Sacramento or directly from the hotel driveway; and he felt that it should have been possible for the applicants to design a ramp to the garage within the hotel building so that automobile traffic entering the garage would not have to use Sproule Lane. Mr. Bancroft pointed out that Sproule Lane is very narrow; and he remarked that the result of using that street for hotel traffic would be outrageous. In addition to the possibility of providing a ramp inside the building to the garage, Mrs. Bovet, another resident of the area, had previously suggested that it might be possible to widen Sproule Lane by removal of the easterly sidewalk so that people other than the guests of the proposed hotel would be able to use the street. In conclusion, Mr. Bancroft stated that while he did not like the fact that the proposed project would decrease the value of his client's property, he did not wish to speak in opposition to the hotel; however, he felt that the traffic problems which would be proposed by the hotel as presently planned could and should be resolved by the experts of the staff of the Department of City Planning to the satisfaction of the community.

Ronald Pengilly, representing Mr. and Mrs. Antoine F. Bovet, 154 Sproule Lane, stated that his clients were opposed to the revised hotel building since he did not feel that the plans would meet the text of Section 303 of the City Planning Code which provides that conditional uses must be necessary for, desirable for, and compatible with, the neighborhood or the community and that such uses should not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of persons who are residing or working in the vicinity or injurious to property. He stated that the proposed hotel building would do considerable injustice to his client's property since the parking ramp and garage facility of the hotel would abut both the northerly and easterly property lines of their lot.

7/2/70

Mr. Pengilly remarked that the subject application involved almost twice as much land as the original proposal; and the hotel which would be built would be 25% higher than the original hotel building and would have one-third again as many rooms. Furthermore, the revised proposal would make maximum use of the property under the provisions of the City Planning Code. Viewed in that light, he felt that it should be recognized that the applicants were actually proposing a substantial revision of the hotel which had previously been authorized by the Commission. The open space which had been mentioned by the applicants would actually be on the roof of the garage structure; and he feared that it might be possible for people to obtain direct access from the open space to a deck on his client's property. The worse factor of all, however, would be the traffic pattern proposed for the hotel which would severely inconvenience his clients. He stated that he had called the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works to ask if they had made an analysis of the automobile and truck traffic which would be generated by the proposed hotel and had received a negative reply. Thus, he had been forced to reach his own conclusions regarding the amount of traffic which would be generated by the hotel. He noted that the applicants proposed to construct 90 parking spaces in the proposed garage or more than twice the number of spaces which would be required by the Code; and he noted that developers to not provide more parking than is absolutely essential because the construction of parking facilities is not economical. Therefore, he assumed that a great deal of traffic would be brought to the area by the hotel. As proposed, the entrance to the hotel garage would be on Sproule Lane opposite the exit from the garage of the Nob Hill apartments; and, given the present traffic congestion on Sproule Lane, he felt that the new garage entrance would create an impossible situation. Furthermore, the ramp to the proposed garage would be constructed next to his client's property and would create a problem of noise pollution. Under the circumstances, he was extremely interested in Mr. Bancroft's suggestion that the ramp to the proposed garage should be located completely within the hotel building.

Mr. Pengilly felt that the original plans for the proposed hotel had been sufficient; and he believed that construction of the expanded hotel presently being proposed would create an absolutely intolerable situation because of its bulk, its coverage, and its traffic problems. Therefore, he hoped that the subject application would be disapproved because it fails to meet the criteria for conditional uses which are set forth in Section 303 of the City Planning Code. However, if the Commission were disposed to approve a larger hotel for the site, he hoped that revisions could be made in the plans so that it would be set back from his clients' property and so that access to the garage to the hotel would be less disruptive to the neighborhood. He also urged that the Commission require the developer to post a bond giving assurance that the open space on top of the proposed garage structure would be landscaped and permanently maintained.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp, biting cold that seemed to penetrate my very bones. I shivered as I walked towards the building, my hands tucked into my pockets. The air was thick with the scent of old stone and the distant hum of city traffic. I had heard that the building was haunted, but I never imagined it would feel so... so alive. The entrance was a grand affair, with high ceilings and ornate carvings. I hesitated for a moment before stepping inside, my eyes taking in the vastness of the space. The floor was made of polished stone, reflecting the light from the chandeliers above. I walked deeper into the building, my footsteps echoing off the walls. The air grew colder, and I could feel a presence watching me from the shadows. I turned around, but saw nothing. I continued on, my heart pounding in my chest. The building seemed to have a mind of its own, a will of its own. I had come here for a reason, but I was beginning to wonder if I was truly ready for what I might find.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp, biting cold that seemed to penetrate my very bones. I shivered as I walked towards the building, my hands tucked into my pockets. The air was thick with the scent of old stone and the distant hum of city traffic. I had heard that the building was haunted, but I never imagined it would feel so... so alive. The entrance was a grand affair, with high ceilings and ornate carvings. I hesitated for a moment before stepping inside, my eyes taking in the vastness of the space. The floor was made of polished stone, reflecting the light from the chandeliers above. I walked deeper into the building, my footsteps echoing off the walls. The air grew colder, and I could feel a presence watching me from the shadows. I turned around, but saw nothing. I continued on, my heart pounding in my chest. The building seemed to have a mind of its own, a will of its own. I had come here for a reason, but I was beginning to wonder if I was truly ready for what I might find.

7/2/70

James Meyer, a traffic engineer employed by De Leuw Cather, stated that the suggestion of an indoor ramp to the parking garage had been raised during one of the meetings with residents of the subject neighborhood. The feasibility of that approach had been investigated; however, because of the placement of columns for the building, because of the steepness of the grade to the parking garage, and because of the necessity of maintaining a large lobby area, it had been determined that construction of the indoor ramp would be impossible. He emphasized, however, that the amount of traffic which would be brought to Sproule Lane by the revised hotel would be less than one-half the amount of traffic which would have been placed on that street if the original hotel had been constructed. Under the revised proposal, vehicles would leave the garage by way of Malvina Place rather than Sproule Lane; and, it would also be possible for the vehicles to use Ewer Place for access to the garage rather than Sproule Lane. All service vehicles would enter the building from Ewer Place and would exit by way of Malvina Place. Under the circumstances, he felt that the traffic situation on Sproule Lane would be infinitely better as a result of the revisions which were being proposed in the plans for the hotel building. With regard to Ewer Place and Malvina Place, he remarked that he did not regard them to be major thoroughfares at the present time; and, even if they would have to serve between 100 and 200 additional vehicles over a 24-hour period as a result of construction of the new hotel, he did not believe that those streets would become major thoroughfares.

Commissioner Porter emphasized that the issue before the Commission was not whether any hotel building should be constructed on the subject site but whether modification of the hotel building which had already been approved should be permitted. She remarked that the subject property could be developed with an apartment building containing 150 residential units and 150 parking spaces without any action whatsoever by the Commission. Such an apartment building would block views and create traffic problems within the area; and the Commission would have no authority to establish conditions to protect the neighborhood.

Mr. Pengilly remarked that the revised plans for the hotel might result in a better traffic pattern for Sproule Lane; however, the new traffic pattern would have an extremely detrimental effect on Malvina Place, which has a roadway of only 14½ feet. Since it would be impossible for an automobile and a truck going in opposite directions on Malvina Place to pass each other, he assumed that Malvina Place would have to be turned into a one-way street if the subject application were approved.

Kim Clark, representing the attorney for the Pacific Union Club, indicated that he wished to join Mr. Bancroft and Mr. Pengilly in objecting to the traffic situation which would be created by the proposed hotel.

7/2/70

Alfred Krieger, a resident in the Nob Hill apartment building, asked if the City would retain the present two-way traffic pattern on Sproule Lane if the proposed hotel were to be constructed. The Director replied that the staff of the Department of City Planning had made no recommendation regarding the direction of traffic flow on Sproule Lane.

Mr. Krieger, stated that it is almost impossible for two automobiles going in opposite directions to pass on Sproule Lane at the present time without using the sidewalk; and he felt that the Commission should take that matter into account during its deliberations.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would have no objection to making Sproule Lane into a one-way street if residents of the area so desired. With regard to the proposal under consideration, he noted that while no-one objected to the hotel use as such, it seemed that everyone who had spoken desired to established conditions which would make construction of the hotel impossible. He remarked that if an apartment building were to be constructed on the portion of the site fronting on Malvina Place, the design of the garage for such a building would probably be similar to the garage which had been designed for the hotel; and, as a result, Malvina Place would experience traffic problems in any case. Furthermore, if the property fronting on Malvina Place were not developed as proposed by the present applicants, it could be developed with quite a large apartment building which would have more of a detrimental effect on Mr. Browning's property than would the proposed garage structure. With regard to the interior ramp to the parking garage which had been suggested by Mr. Bancroft, the Director remarked that the possibility of such a design had been reviewed by the staff of the Department of City Planning and had been found to be unworkable. He recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for review by the Commission. After asking Mr. Steele to read the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Patmont stated that the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable to him.

Mr. Bancroft stated that he regretted that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not given consideration to the possibility of widening Sproule Lane. He stated that Sproule Lane does not adequately serve the buildings which are presently in existence in the area; and, as a result, he felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning should have recommended that the roadway of Sproule Lane be widened to include the sidewalk area on the east side. He also felt that the staff should have required the applicant to provide an indoor ramp to the parking garage. Therefore, he urged the Commission to add another condition to the draft resolution which would require the staff of the Department of City Planning to undertake further study of traffic problems in and around the proposed hotel with particular emphasis being given to the traffic problems on Sproule Lane.

7/2/70

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Finn arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Mr. Pengilly acknowledged that neither residents of the neighborhood nor the City Planning Commission would have any control over development of the subject site if an apartment building were to be constructed. He pointed out, however, that the present applicants were requesting approval of the conditional use application for a hotel; and, in authorizing a conditional use, he felt that the Commission had both the authority and the responsibility to require that the proposed building be set back a specific distance from the property owned by his client.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked about the roadway widths of Sproule Lane, Malvina Place and Ewer Place. Mr. Steele replied that the width of the streets as scaled from the plans for the proposed building was approximately 11½ feet for Ewer Place, 13 feet for Malvina Place, 22 feet for Sproule Lane.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked about the width of a standard vehicle lane. The Director replied that the standard traffic lane ordinarily has a width of 11 or 12 feet.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6558 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

At this point in the proceedings, the Director absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

CU70.43 444 Divisadero Street, east line, 100 feet south of Fell Street. Request for expansion of a non-conforming automobile washing facility in C-2 and R-4 Districts. (Under advisement from meetings of June 4 and 18, 1970)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), noted that the staff of the Department of City Planning, during the meeting of June 18, had recommended that the subject application be disapproved because the increased activity proposed on the subject site could result in traffic congestion on Divisadero Street and because approval of the application might provide an argument to the owner in the future to request extension beyond the 1980 termination date of the non-conforming use occupying the central portion of the site. The Commission; however, had indicated its desire to approve the application and had taken the matter under advisement until the present meeting to enable the staff of the Department of City Planning to prepare a draft resolution of approval containing

7/2/70

specific conditions. He distributed copies of the draft resolution which had been prepared and summarized the eight conditions which it contained.

George Choppelas, attorney for the applicant, stated that the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6559 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM70.23 CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO 40-FOOT SPECIAL
ZT70.8 HEIGHT DISTRICT FOR THE CLIFF HOUSE AND FORMER SUTRO
 BATHS AREA.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that a 40-foot height limit for the Cliff House and former Sutro Baths properties was first enacted in 1967 and was made permanent by Ordinance No. 177-70 which was approved May 28, 1970, after extensive study and public hearings. However, when the Ordinance was being considered by the Board of Supervisors, the Board had requested that the Department of City Planning consider amendment of the City Planning Code to establish a height limit of 20 feet with conditional use authorization to a total height of 40 feet for the Cliff House-Sutro Baths area. Subsequently, Supervisor Maillard had requested that the Department of City Planning also consider any other alternatives which would serve to preserve the view from Merrie Way as it currently exists and which would preserve the amenities and be complimentary to the natural beauty of the land in the vicinity of the Cliff House-Sutro Baths property.

Mr. Steele showed a series of photographic slides to describe the topography of the subject property and to illustrate the location of important vantage points. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had considered a number of alternative approaches to height limitations which might preserve public views over the site, including sloping sight-line height limits; but the staff had concluded that all of the alternatives with the exception of the 20-foot limit with the possibility of an increase to 40 feet on portions of the site through conditional use procedures would be very difficult to administer and would not achieve the objectives sought by the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was deeply concerned about preservation of the views over the Cliff House-Sutro Baths site; however, she noted that the voters of San Francisco had failed to support a bond issue which would have made it possible to acquire the property as public open space. She did not see what purpose would be served in establishing a 20-foot height limit for the property since it seemed to her that any development of the site

SECRET

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

...the ... of the ... which is ...

7/2/70

whatsoever would take away the view which is presently available. Mr. Steele replied that construction under a 20-foot height limit would not disrupt views of the ocean over the site from Lincoln Park; however, it was apparent that construction of buildings under a 20-foot height limit would remove the view of the ocean for people on Point Lobos Avenue.

Commissioner Newman asked if the 1968 bond issue for acquisition of the Cliff House-Sutro Baths property had obtained more than a majority vote. Commissioner Fleishhacker replied in the negative.

Mrs. Hans Klussman, representing San Francisco Beautiful, confirmed that the 1968 bond issue had not obtained a majority vote; however, she felt that the bond issue would be successful if it were to be placed on the ballot today. She felt that there must be some means of preserving the subject site as public open space; and, since the property is a natural park and recreational area, no improvements would be needed on the site. In a city which can afford to build \$200,000,000 buildings, she felt that it should be possible to find ten million dollars to purchase such an important public asset as the Cliff House-Sutro Baths property.

Mrs. Dorothy Gibbons, representing the Outer Richmond Neighborhood Association, stated that her organization hoped that the subject property could be retained as open space for the enjoyment of residents of San Francisco as well as tourists. Once buildings are constructed on the site, they will remain forever; and, for that reason, she hoped that the Commission would approve a 20-foot height limit for the site with the additional provision that no buildings should rise higher than the level of Point Lobos Avenue and Merrie Way.

Mrs. Anna Lenn, a member of the Outer Richmond Neighborhood Association, asked the Secretary to read a letter which she had prepared. In the letter Mrs. Lenn stated that all of the people present in the audience should be ashamed of themselves for allowing the incomparable Sutro Baths to fall into the hands of "money makers" and real estate developers; and she thought it was no wonder that the youth are rebelling against an older generation which would allow a priceless public asset to be developed and destroyed. If a 20-foot height limit, a 10-foot height limit, or even a 5-foot height limit would allow the construction of buildings which would obstruct even a fraction of the irreplaceable and world-famous view, then such height limits would not be sufficiently strict. She felt the answer to the problem was simple; the Commission should declare that no buildings should be constructed on the site which would intrude into even the smallest portion of the view presently enjoyed.

7/2/70

Michael Levin, a resident of the Outer Richmond District, agreed with the previous speakers that everything possible should be done to preserve the views over the Cliff House-Sutro Baths properties. He stated that he had been disappointed in recent actions taken by the City Planning Commission which had resulted in damage to the skyline; and he felt that the action to be taken on the proposed height limits would be indicative of the Commission's concern for people.

Mrs. Eugene Brodsky, representing the San Francisco Chapter of the Sierra Club, stated that her organization continued to urge public acquisition of the subject property, possibly as a part of a new headlands park which is presently under consideration. In the meantime, she supported the establishment of any height limitations which would serve to protect existing views.

Jerry Swett, 2671 El Camino del Mar, stated that he is a member of San Francisco Tomorrow. He stated that the members of his organization are property owners who do not believe in the infringement of property rights; however, he noted that the nature of property rights has changed. When he was young, children had access to the beach at the Sutro Baths property and had enjoyed a swimming pool on the site in addition. Today, all of the other parks in the city are overcrowded and there is nowhere else to go except Seal Rocks. He felt that the subject property should be acquired as public open space; and he indicated that his organization would support another bond issue for acquisition of the property if such a proposal could be placed on the ballot; however, if that approach were not feasible, he felt that an ordinance should be adopted containing the following provisions:

- "A. That no part of this ordinance shall be construed to allow in any way the diminution of a present unobstructed view from Merrie Way of the ocean, all the seal rocks and the entire shoreline;
- B. That the upper limit of the top-most feature of all construction must be at least a specific number of feet below Merrie Way;
- C. That no construction may conflict with the contour of the land by exceeding the height of the nearest point of the natural bowl caused by the Great Highway, Point Lobos, Merrie Way and the ridge on the north side of these configurations;
- D. That all construction must compliment the natural beauty of the land by being of distinguished and complimentary design;
- E. That, to effect the foregoing, all proposed construction in the area be subject to conditional use review."

The first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the
the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the

the sixth is the fact that the
the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the
the tenth is the fact that the

the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the
the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the
the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the
the nineteenth is the fact that the
the twentieth is the fact that the

the twenty-first is the fact that the
the twenty-second is the fact that the
the twenty-third is the fact that the
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the

the twenty-sixth is the fact that the
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the
the thirtieth is the fact that the

the thirty-first is the fact that the
the thirty-second is the fact that the
the thirty-third is the fact that the
the thirty-fourth is the fact that the
the thirty-fifth is the fact that the

the thirty-sixth is the fact that the
the thirty-seventh is the fact that the
the thirty-eighth is the fact that the
the thirty-ninth is the fact that the
the fortieth is the fact that the

the forty-first is the fact that the
the forty-second is the fact that the
the forty-third is the fact that the
the forty-fourth is the fact that the
the forty-fifth is the fact that the

Mr. Swett stated that San Francisco Tomorrow had previously addressed a letter to Dianne Feinstein, President of the Board of Supervisors, requesting that such an ordinance be adopted. He also indicated that while the members of his organization did not wish to hurt the owners of the subject property, they were of the opinion that the loss of such a valuable public asset would have the effect of lessening the value of their own properties.

J. Edward Fleishell, representing the owners of a portion of the Sutro Baths property, stated that his clients had actually created the view which people now enjoy by demolishing the structures which had previously occupied the site after they had been damaged by fire. He displayed a photograph of the buildings which had occupied the site, noting that some of the structures which had a height of 60 feet could not be duplicated under the existing 40-foot height limit. In fact, he felt that any development of the site under the 40-foot height limit would be a marginal proposition because of the difficulty of obtaining loan commitments. If the height limit were changed to 20 feet with the possibility of 40-foot buildings being permitted on portions of the site through conditional use procedures, lending institutions would treat the property as if it were subject to a flat 20-foot height limit; and the result would be that a loan could not be obtained. He emphasized that the 60-foot structures which had housed the baths had not blocked views since they were located considerably below the grade of Point Lobos Avenue; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the City Planning Commission should not approve a further reduction of the 40-foot height limit which had already been established by the Board of Supervisors.

William Coblentz, representing the owners of a portion of the subject property located uphill from the site formerly occupied by the baths, noted that his clients had supported the bond issue for acquisition of the property vocally and with money. After the bond issue had failed, his clients had contacted both Federal and State governmental agencies to see if they could provide funds for purchase of the property; however, those efforts had been of no avail. Now, a number of people were saying that nothing should be constructed on the site which would intrude into the view; but if legislation were to be passed which would have the effect of prohibiting private development of the property, thus achieving by ordinance what the voters had refused to support, the result would amount to inverse condemnation of private property rights. He stated that his clients had developed a plan for development of their property; however, because both the cost of loans and the cost of construction had increased so rapidly, they had not been able to proceed with the proposed development. Mr. Coblentz stated that he would have confidence in the Commission as presently constituted to administer fairly the 20-40-foot height limit which was now being proposed; however, he did not have the same amount of confidence in successive Commissions yet unknown. He stated that his clients had spent \$1,000,000 for the subject property; and, in addition, they had spent \$500,000 for preparation of plans for the proposed development. They had worked closely with the City and had not objected to the

The above is a summary of the information received from the various sources mentioned above. It is to be understood that the information is not complete and that further investigation is being conducted. The information is being furnished for your information and for the use of the various agencies mentioned above.

The above is a summary of the information received from the various sources mentioned above. It is to be understood that the information is not complete and that further investigation is being conducted. The information is being furnished for your information and for the use of the various agencies mentioned above.

The above is a summary of the information received from the various sources mentioned above. It is to be understood that the information is not complete and that further investigation is being conducted. The information is being furnished for your information and for the use of the various agencies mentioned above.

7/2/70

40-foot height limit when it was being proposed. Under the circumstances, he felt that enactment of the proposed 20-40-foot height limit at this point in time would be unfair.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had previously supported the 20-40-foot height limit for the subject property and had withdrawn her support from that proposal when she had learned that even a 20-foot height limit would not preserve existing views. She did not feel that the Commission had the authority to prevent private development of the property; however, in view of the previous willingness of the owners to co-operate with the City, she expected that they might be willing to provide certain view corridors through the site for the benefit of the public. Mr. Coblentz replied that his clients would be willing to work with the Commission to that end.

Mr. Steele stated that the 20-40-foot height limit had previously been proposed by the Director of Planning to the City Planning Commission. While it was clear that development under a 20-foot height limit would probably be uneconomical, it was believed that development of portions of the site to a height of 40 feet through conditional use procedures would allow an economically viable project to be undertaken. He did not agree with Mr. Coblentz that the 40-foot height limit contingent upon conditional use authorization of the Commission would amount to adverse condemnation since all new uses in the Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 1 are subject to conditional use authorization by the Commission. He recommended that the Commission approve the 20-foot height limit with authority for conditional use approval up to a maximum of 40 feet; and he distributed copies of two draft resolutions which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission which would approve the City Planning Code text and map amendments which would be necessary.

President Kearney asked if it would be possible for the Commission to retain the existing 40-foot height limit for the subject property and yet have authority to control development on the site. Mr. Steele replied that the Commission could control development on the site either by exercise of its discretionary authority or by the establishment of a special use district. He indicated, however, that establishment of a special use district would require another public hearing.

Commissioner Porter remarked that she had previously been advised by the staff of the Department of City Planning that a 20-foot height limit on the subject property would not preserve views. Under the circumstances, she did not see how anything constructive could be achieved by establishment of a 20-40-foot height limit.

Mr. Steele replied that the amended text of the City Planning Code would outline special criteria which could be used by the Commission in considering conditional use applications for buildings which would exceed the 20-foot height limit; and, as a result, the Commission would be able to exercise a type of planned unit development control over any proposed development of the

It is not possible to say that the Government is not doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

The Government is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

The Government is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

The Government is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

The Government is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

The Government is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people. It is doing its best to improve the situation of the people.

7/2/70

subject property. The criteria which were being recommended were as follows:

- "1. The siting and shape of the building or structure and its relationship to the character of the area and to other buildings, structures and open space;
2. The effect of the building or structure upon views of the ocean, the shoreline and the natural land forms, especially views from public areas;
3. The degree of sympathy between the building or structure and the natural land forms and texture; and
4. The probable effect of the building or structure upon the future use, enjoyment and development of other properties in the area, both public and private."

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that a 40-foot height limit for the site would be reasonable providing that any proposed developments were to be designed in such a way that they would not totally block all of the views presently available. However, the obvious purpose of a 20-40-foot height limit would be to hold a threat over the owners of the property, forcing them to meet the conditions of the Commission in order to achieve any development whatsoever; and, in all fairness to the owners of the property, he did not feel that such an approach would be desirable. He believed that some other means of achieving the objectives of the Commission should be available; and he felt that the best approach for the Commission to take might be to exercise its discretionary authority over any developments proposed for the site.

Mr. Steele remarked that any actions taken by the Commission as a result of a discretionary review would be appealable to the Board of Permit Appeals rather than to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was anxious to know what type of project the owners of the property had in mind before voting on the matter presently under consideration. Mr. Coblenz stated that the plans which his clients had previously prepared for development of their property should be disregarded. Mr. Fleishell stated that his clients had not prepared any plans for development of their portion of the site.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Porter that a resolution be adopted supporting retention of the existing 40-foot height limit for the subject property and announcing the City Planning Commission's intention of reviewing under its discretionary authority any plans for development of the property with the objective in mind of prohibiting the construction of any building which would substantially block existing views.

subject property. The criteria which were being recommended were as follows:

- "1. The siting and shape of the building or structure and its relationship to the character of the area and to other buildings, structures and open space;
2. The effect of the building or structure upon views of the ocean, the shoreline and the natural land forms, especially views from public areas;
3. The degree of sympathy between the building or structure and the natural land forms and texture; and
4. The probable effect of the building or structure upon the future use, enjoyment and development of other properties in the area, both public and private."

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that a 40-foot height limit for the site would be reasonable providing that any proposed developments were to be designed in such a way that they would not totally block all of the views presently available. However, the obvious purpose of a 20-40-foot height limit would be to hold a threat over the owners of the property, forcing them to meet the conditions of the Commission in order to achieve any development whatsoever; and, in all fairness to the owners of the property, he did not feel that such an approach would be desirable. He believed that some other means of achieving the objectives of the Commission should be available; and he felt that the best approach for the Commission to take might be to exercise its discretionary authority over any developments proposed for the site.

Mr. Steele remarked that any actions taken by the Commission as a result of a discretionary review would be appealable to the Board of Permit Appeals rather than to the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he was anxious to know what type of project the owners of the property had in mind before voting on the matter presently under consideration. Mr. Coblenz stated that the plans which his clients had previously prepared for development of their property should be disregarded. Mr. Fleishell stated that his clients had not prepared any plans for development of their portion of the site.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Porter that a resolution be adopted supporting retention of the existing 40-foot height limit for the subject property and announcing the City Planning Commission's intention of reviewing under its discretionary authority any plans for development of the property with the objective in mind of prohibiting the construction of any building which would substantially block existing views.

Commissioner Newman stated that he had confidence in the good intentions of the present owners of the subject properties; however, because of the possibility that the properties might be sold, he felt that it would be desirable for the Commission to be in the strongest position possible. Therefore, he intended to support the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning for a 20-40-foot height limit which would place on the the owners of the property the burden of proving to the satisfaction of the Commission that any buildings proposed for the site would not block views.

Commissioner Kitchie stated that he, also, intended to support the recommendation of the staff.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 4-3 to adopt the resolution proposed by Commissioner Fleishhacker as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6560. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Kearney and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioners Miller, Newman and Ritchie voted "No".

ZM70.20 Pacific Heights area bounded by Lyon Street, the midblock between Pacific Avenue and Jackson Street, Scott Street and the midblock between Green and Vallejo Streets. R-1 to an R-1-D District.

ZM70.19 Pacific Heights area bounded by Scott Street, Broadway, Broderick Street and Pacific Avenue. R-1 to an R-1-D District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to described the subject property, noting that the majority of the lots under consideration are occupied by large, older but well-maintained, single-family dwellings. He stated that application ZM70.20 had been filed by the Pacific Heights Association; and application ZM70.19, involving property which was also included in application ZM70.20, had been filed by Martha Alexander Gerbode. Both applications had requested reclassification of the subject properties from R-1 to R-1-D.

Mr. Steele stated that the standards applicable to R-1-D and R-1 zoned property differ primarily in permitted density, size of lot, and required side yards. The minimum lot area for any new lot created in an R-1-D District is 4,000 square feet; and such lots must have a minimum width of 33 feet. In R-1 Districts, unlike R-1-D Districts, more than one dwelling unit may be constructed on a lot within the density limitation of not more than one dwelling unit for each 3,000 square feet of lot area. The City Planning Code does not require a side yard for dwellings in an R-1 District but does require side yards in an R-1-D District for lots having a width grater than 28 feet. Lot coverage permitted in an R-1-D District is limited to 60% on corner lots and 55% on interior lots, as compared with R-1 District standards

7/2/70

allowing coverage of 75% and 60% respectively. The rear yard and zoning height limitations are the same for both zoning districts.

Mr. Steele stated that of the 186 lots included in the subject applications, 129 are 4,000 square feet or more in area. Sixty of the 129 lots are sufficiently large under R-1 density standards to be developed with more than one dwelling unit. Sixty-nine lots within the subject area are of sufficient width and area to be resubdivided into 182 lots meeting minimum R-1 lot size standards; however, such subdivision would require the demolition of many of the single-family dwellings which occupy the lots. Of the 186 subject lots, 49 are presently developed with dwellings having side yards which meet R-1-D standards; and a number of other dwellings in the subject area are so designed as to give the impression of side yards although not fully meeting the requirements of the R-1-D District for such yards. Fifteen lots in the subject area are vacant.

Mr. Steele stated that if the subject application were approved, any existing legally constructed dwellings on lots not meeting the R-1-D standards would not have a termination date and could be replaced if destroyed by fire or other act of God. However, such dwellings could not be altered or enlarged so as to increase any discrepancy between existing conditions on the lot and the required standards for open space for new construction set forth in the City Planning Code for R-1-D Districts.

Raymond Haas, 2110 Green Street, advised the Commission that the Pacific Heights Association of Neighbors and the Cow Hollow Improvement Association had cooperated in the filing of application ZM70.20. The primary purpose of the application would be to preserve the present character of the neighborhood by eliminating the possibility of using Section 127 of the City Planning Code to construct more than one dwelling unit on a single lot and by eliminating the possibility of having any of the subject lots subdivided into smaller 25-foot lots as permitted in R-1 zoning districts. Mr. Haas emphasized that most of the subject properties have been developed in a manner consistent with R-1-D zoning; and he indicated that a majority of the property owners involved had been interviewed and had indicated their support of the rezoning.

Richard E. Gugenhime, 2817 Buchanan Street, also assured the Commission that most of the residents of the subject neighborhood were in favor of having their properties reclassified to R-1-D; and he felt that the desire of the property owners involved should have an influence on the decision of the Commission. In conclusion, he stated that he would be willing to document his claim that most of the property owners involved were in favor of the rezoning if such documentation were desired by the Commission.

William Abeel, 2711 Pacific Avenue, urged that the subject application be approved and advised the Commission that all of the property owners on his side of the street hoped that their properties would be included in the R-1-D zoning district at a later date.

7/2/70

Mrs. John Boswell, 2910 Vallejo Street, stated that she had been working for 3½ years to prepare the subject application; and she indicated that she was convinced that the proposed reclassification had the support of the residents of the area. She, also, volunteered to document her claim for support of the application if such information were desired by the Commission.

President Kearney asked for a show of hands of the individuals present in the audience who were present in support of the subject applications. A large number of people responded.

Mary Libra, owner and director of the Hillwood Academic Day School located at 2521 Scott Street, stated that she was in favor of the proposed rezoning of properties located in the subject neighborhood from R-1 to R-1-D; however, she hoped that her property could be excluded from the application. She advised the Commission that loans are made not on the basis of the value of the improvements but on the value of the land itself; and she had been advised that the proposed reclassification would lessen the value of her property. However, since deletion of the single lot from the application would make a "zig-zag" line on the zoning map, she suggested that it might be better from a zoning standpoint to delete the adjoining corner lot from the application as well; and she had been advised by the owners of that parcel of property that they would not object to her proposal.

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from Mrs. D. V. Nicholson, 2841 Vallejo Street, and from Edward J. Taaffe, 2889 Pacific Avenue, objecting to the proposed reclassification.

Mrs. James B. Lowery advised the Commission that Mrs. Libra's neighbors had signed the petition stating that they wished to have their property rezoned to R-1-D. Mrs. Libra replied that her neighbors did wish to have their property reclassified; however, they had indicated to her that they would not object to having their property remain in an R-1 Zoning District if it were important to avoid a "zig-zag" zoning line.

Mr. Steele remarked that the characteristics of the subject area are more typical of R-1-D zoned districts than R-1 districts; and, in that respect, he regarded the subject area as being significantly different from all other R-1 districts in the city with the possible exception of the adjacent Cow Hollow and Presidio Heights neighborhoods. He remarked that reclassification of the subject properties to R-1-D, which would have the effect of establishing larger lot-size requirements and prohibiting more than one dwelling unit per lot, would prevent major disruption of the existing character of the neighborhood and would encourage maintenance of the fine homes in the area. Therefore, he recommended that applications ZM70.20 be approved; and, since that application includes properties involved in application ZM70.19, he recommended that Mrs. Gerbode withdraw her application.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6561 be adopted and that application ZM70.20 be approved.

After Mrs. Gerbode had requested withdrawal of application ZM70.19, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6562 be adopted and that the withdrawal of application ZM70.19 be approved.

ZM70.18 201-315 Balboa Street, properties fronting on both sides of the street between 3rd Avenue and 95 feet west of 4th Avenue. R-1 to a C-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that a total of 13 lots had been included in the subject application, nine of which are occupied by such non-conforming uses as stores, restaurants and service establishments. The remaining lots are developed with low-density dwellings. Reclassification of the properties would bring seven of the nine non-conforming uses in the strip into conformity with the Planning Code; the two remaining non-conforming uses would become non-conforming commercial uses in a C-1 District with no expiration date.

H. T. Davies, the applicant, stated that most of the properties in the subject block had been used for commercial purposes since 1911. Yet, while properties located west of 4th Avenue had retained commercial zoning, the properties included in the subject application had been reclassified to R-4 some time in the past. He remarked that the residential buildings in the subject neighborhood had recently been improved as a result of a Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Program; and he felt that the small businesses which serve the adjacent residential uses should be allowed to remain in business.

Albert Duchi, owner of property located at 301 Balboa Street, stated that he did not understand why the subject properties had been reclassified from commercial to R-4 in the first place.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that the existing commercial uses on the subject properties are primarily neighborhood oriented; and he noted that they have been established for a long time and that their economic viability is reinforced by the existing transit line on Balboa Street. He also remarked that the subject properties are devoted to uses similar to those in the adjacent C-1 zoning district to the west. Therefore, he recommended that the subject

7/2/70

application be approved and that the subject properties be reclassified from R-4 to C-1.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6563 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

ZM70.21 222-242 Lee Avenue, east line, between 100 and 200 feet north of Holloway Avenue. R-2 to an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject properties. He stated that each of the four lots is presently occupied by one single-family dwelling unit; and while the properties are located in an R-2 zoning district, most of the properties in that district are developed for single-family use. The R-3 zoning district which extends along Holloway Avenue is developed primarily with single-family and two-family dwellings. He stated that the applicants had requested reclassification of the subject properties from R-2 to R-3 in order to "rehabilitate the property by building a new multi-family structure, a low- and moderate-income 12-unit apartment structure."

Donald S. Cavanaugh, representing the owner of the subject property, stated that the poorly-maintained buildings which presently occupy the lots would be torn down and replaced with a new apartment building. The new apartment building would improve the appearance of the neighborhood; and it would increase the tax base of the city. In addition, the apartment building would provide housing for low-income families.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if a rendering of the proposed apartment building were available. Mr. Cavanaugh replied in the negative and indicated that he would be willing to have a rendering prepared if it would be of interest to the Commission.

Mike Mooney, representing the Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside Community Association, Incorporated (OMI), asked if the subject property would be used for a Turnkey Public Housing Project. After Mr. Cavanaugh had replied in the negative, Mr. Mooney advised the Commission that the subject neighborhood has more than 500 welfare families; and he indicated that 250 people had been present at the last meeting of his organization to vote unanimously against any additional public housing in their neighborhood. If the subject site were not to be used for public housing, he believed that the proposed reclassification would probably be acceptable to members of the community. Mr. Mooney also remarked that there are presently at least 27 foster care homes in the subject neighborhood which exist in violation of the City Planning Code; and, as a result, he felt that the local governmental structure is not favoring his neighborhood with its support.

7/2/70

Mrs. Cole, 32 Holloway Avenue, asked if the proposed apartment building would have a back yard as well as off-street parking. Mr. Cavanaugh replied that the apartment building would have a back yard with a depth of 20 or 25 feet and one off-street parking space for each dwelling unit beneath the building.

Mrs. Cole stated that the proposed apartment building would probably destroy her view and lower the value of her property.

William Hogan, 26 Holloway Avenue, stated that it was his understanding that the subject parcels of property are owned by three separate individuals. He stated that he would like to have new buildings constructed on the subject property; however, he would not favor any proposal which would result in an increased density in the neighborhood, particularly an increase in the population of children. He remarked that it costs \$700 a year to educate a child; and, as a result, the proposed apartment building would cost the city much more than it would pay on the tax roles if it were to be occupied by a large number of children. He stated that schools in the subject neighborhood are overcrowded and have no room to expand; and, given the type of things which have been happening in the neighborhood, it seemed to him almost as if the City must have a plan designed to bring about the deterioration of the neighborhood. If the subject property were to be reclassified and developed with an apartment building for lower- and middle-income families, it would not be possible to control the type of people who would occupy the building; and he noted that many black members of OMI have expressed interest in achieving a better racial balance and more stability for the neighborhood by discouraging more black people from coming into the area. The neighborhood is well on its way toward becoming a ghetto; and, if more blacks were to move into the area, it might in fact become a ghetto rather than a racially integrated neighborhood.

Commissioner Ritchie asked the staff of the Department of City Planning to follow up on Mr. Mooney's complaint about the 27 illegal foster care homes in the subject neighborhood.

Mr. Steele noted that the subject properties are located adjacent to an R-3 District on Holloway Avenue where the existing development has not yet reached the intensity permitted by that zoning; and he indicated that the applicant had not shown a need for the expansion of that R-3 District into a low-intensity residential area which is developed primarily with single-family dwellings. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6564 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

7/2/70

CU70.68 840 Battery Street, west line, 137.5 feet north of Broadway. Request for 90 off-street parking spaces in Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 3 (C-2) instead of the 40 spaces required by the City Planning Code.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property is presently occupied by a two-story brick building housing a furniture warehouse and showroom on the upper floor. The applicant proposed to operate a parking garage on the ground floor of the existing building with as many as 90 parking spaces whereas only 40 parking spaces would be required by the City Planning Code to serve the commercial floor area of the building.

Donald Conrad, the applicant, stated that the owner of the subject building would not consent to a permanent change in the character of the building. Therefore, he was requesting permission to use the lower floor of the building for 90 parking spaces with the specific proviso that he be permitted to terminate the conditional use authorization at a future date if he so desired. He did not believe that the additional parking spaces being requested would interfere with traffic in the area.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that the subject property is located within an area recommended in the Northern Waterfront Master Plan as appropriate for off-street parking facilities; and he indicated that the design of the proposed garage was such that it would not result in any conflict with vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the adjacent streets. Since the site is easily accessible from the Embarcadero Freeway, and since it would provide appropriate parking for persons doing business in the area, he felt that the application should be approved subject to four specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted.

Commissioner Ritchie asked the applicant if he were willing to comply with condition No. 3 of the draft resolution which specified that street trees conforming to City Planning Department specifications should be installed along the street frontage of the site.

Mr. Conrad asked how many trees would be required. Mr. Steele replied that he felt that approximately two street trees would be appropriate. Mr. Conrad stated that he did not believe that he would have any objection to that condition.

7/2/70

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6565 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU70.70 200-214 London Street, southwest corner of Excelsior Avenue. Request for an automobile parking lot in an R-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the subject property, consisting of three lots, is presently developed with one 4-unit dwelling, one two-family dwelling and one single-family dwelling for a total of seven dwelling units.

The applicant proposed to remove the existing buildings and to construct a parking lot with ten independently accessible parking spaces for use in conjunction with a proposed new Wells Fargo Bank to be constructed in the C-2 District along Mission Street adjacent to the subject property on the west. Preliminary plans which had been filed with the application had indicated that the parking lot would have an entrance on Excelsior Street and exits on both Excelsior and London Streets. The plans had also indicated that a portion of the bank building, including a walk-up service window, would be located in the present R-2 District; however, no application to reclassify the zoning of that area to permit such construction had been made.

Robert A. Fiore, the applicant, informed the Commission that the Wells Fargo Bank intended to spend \$450,000 or \$500,000 to construct a new building to house its branch bank which is now located at Mission Street and Ocean Avenue. He stated that the "pie-shaped" lot presently occupied by the bank cannot be expanded; and, by moving to the new location, the bank would effectively extend the shopping area along Mission Street. He stated that five banks are presently located adjacent to one another at the opposite end of the shopping district; and he felt that relocation of the Wells Fargo branch bank to the subject property would provide a new balance and focus for the shopping area. In conclusion, he stated that it had taken more than two years to locate a suitable site for the bank facility.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Fiore to comment upon the request for a parking lot which was presently under consideration by the Commission. Mr. Fiore replied that the bank building would front on Mission Street and would be located in a commercial district; however, the bank would not be interested in the property unless it were allowed to develop a parking lot on the residentially-zoned properties to the rear which were the subject of the conditional use application now before the Commission.

7/2/70

Mr. Steele, noting that the plans which had been submitted to the Department of City Planning had indicated that a portion of the bank building would encroach into the residentially-zoned property, asked if the applicants intended to revise the plans so that the entire bank building would be located on the commercially-zoned property. Mr. Fiore replied in the affirmative.

Edward Farrah, owner of property located at 4482 Mission Street, stated that he and other merchants in the area regarded the proposal for construction of the new bank building as an event which would stimulate a new period of growth in the Excelsior neighborhood by triggering development of other properties by private individuals. He remarked that the neighborhood has been deteriorating; however, if the Wells Fargo Bank felt that the area was worthy of an investment of \$500,000, he believed that others would follow suit. Mr. Farrah noted that many residents of the neighborhood were present in the audience, apparently to oppose the subject application. He did not know the reason for their opposition; however, because of the wording of the notice which had been sent by the Department of City Planning, he suspected that the adjacent property owners did not realize that the proposed parking lot would be a part of the proposed bank development. He also expected that some of the neighbors would claim that a parking lot would be a hazard because of the proximity of a public school; however, when cars are parked off the street, they are not dangerous. Others might be concerned about the relocation of people presently living in the houses which would be demolished to make way for the bank and parking lots; however, one of the houses is occupied by his uncle who will definitely be properly rehoused. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that approval of the proposed parking lot would cause any relocation problems.

Joseph Farrah, operator of a shoe store located at Mission and Excelsior Streets, advised the Commission that he had served on the parking committee of the San Francisco Council of District Merchants last year; and, as a result, it was his opinion that additional parking spaces will be needed in the Excelsior District. The Parking Authority does have a program to provide additional parking spaces in the subject neighborhood; however, he believed that the Commission had a wonderful opportunity to approve the private construction of additional parking spaces in the area at no expense to the City. If the subject parking lot is approved, the funds which the Parking Authority might have allocated to the subject neighborhood could be diverted to other areas.

Commissioner Newman asked if the proposed parking lot would be used strictly by the customers of the Wells Fargo Bank. Mr. Farrah replied that the customers of the bank would probably do business in other stores along Mission Street, also.

7/2/70

Ralph Manso, 234 London Street, stated that he has four children. A number of other families on the street have children; and the children run back and forth along the street. If the proposed parking lot were to be approved, automobiles would be crossing the sidewalk; and the result could be hazardous to children living and playing in the area. Furthermore, since the parking lot would have only 10 parking spaces, it would obviously be crowded most of the time; and customers of the bank might double-park or park in private driveways. The parking lot would probably not be patrolled at night; and, since people have a tendency to congregate in such areas, the parking lot might become a meeting place for undesirable people. He hoped that the subject application would be disapproved.

Mr. Schmolke, 232 London Street, stated that a parking lot had been proposed on London Street eight years ago and had been opposed by 5,000 people. During the interim, the City had installed a new public parking lot in the area. The proposed project would require the removal of seven residences for the proposed parking lot as well as the removal of two residential buildings for the bank itself; and he felt that it made no sense whatsoever to tear down seven residential buildings just to provide parking spaces for 10 cars. Furthermore, the hobby shop located on Mission Street which would be displaced by the bank might be of greater service to himself and other residents of the neighborhood than another bank building. In any case, if the proposed parking lot were approved for the bank, other businesses located along Mission Street would inevitably want to develop parking lots to the rear of their properties, also; and, as a result, the residential character of London Street would be lost. He felt that the whole process should be stopped immediately by disapproval of the subject application.

Mrs. Peter Castellano, 239 London Street, stated that she had lived in the area for 25 years. Families living on the street have a great number of children; and she did not feel that the proposed parking lot would be in keeping with the family character of the street. From her own point of view, the fact that a number of banks are located close together at the opposite end of the shopping district is a convenience since she can pay bills at two of the banks and then go to a third facility to take care of her banking business. She stated that she had strolled along Mission Street on the previous day and had noticed a number of empty metered parking spaces; and, at the same time, vacant parking spaces were also available on the side streets. Under the circumstances, she did not feel that the proposed parking lot would be needed for the bank; and she felt that it would really be used by the customers of the Farrah Department Store. Mrs. Castellano stated that there is no traffic signal at the intersection of London Street and Brazil Avenue; and, as a result, most of the children going to school cross the street with the signal at Excelsior Avenue. Given that circumstance, she felt that it would be extremely undesirable to have a parking lot located at that intersection. In addition to the public school, two other schools are located in the area, bringing a great number of children to the neighborhood. The parking lot itself would create a safety hazard; and, even if the parking

7/2/70

lot were full, other automobiles, not knowing of that fact, would turn onto Excelsior Avenue and add to congestion in the area. She felt that the subject application should be disapproved.

Norma Giusto, a resident of London Street for 45 years, stated that residents of the street would like to retain the present residential character of the area; and, for that reason, she hoped that the proposed parking lot would not be approved. She believed that it would not be possible for the Wells Fargo Bank to acquire the property on the corner of Excelsior Avenue and Mission Street; and, as a result, the bank would have a frontage of only 50 feet on Mission Street. She felt that customers of the bank would find adequate parking spaces on Mission Street itself. Any proposed parking lot would endanger children living in the area and might ultimately affect the zoning and tax rate of other properties in the area; and it would certainly disturb the peaceful character of London Street. She requested that the subject application be disapproved.

Leo Travers, 258 London Street, supported the comments which had been made by previous speakers in opposition to the subject application. He believed that it would not be possible for automobiles to leave the proposed parking lot by way of Excelsior Avenue; and, as a result, they would have to use London Street. Streets in the area are narrow; and, given the congestion which would be brought to the area if the parking lot were approved, it would be inevitable that children living in the area would be injured. He stated that the 40-stall parking lot located on Norton Street is less than one block from the present branch office of the Wells Fargo Bank; and he indicated that there are never more than ten parking stalls occupied in that lot. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that additional parking was needed in the neighborhood. If the proposed parking lot were to be approved, the merchants along Mission Street would not be satisfied and would inevitably want to extend commercial uses onto the residential properties fronting on London Street; and that would ruin the residential character of the area. He stated that two \$55,000 homes have been built on the street in the past two years; and, while property values on the street would not necessarily warrant construction of homes in that price range, the homes, unlike the bank and parking lot, had definitely been an improvement for the area.

Another member of the audience stated that while Mr. Farrah's relatives might be able to find housing if the buildings which they presently occupy were to be demolished, low-income families living in the existing buildings would probably not be so lucky.

George Peterson, 223 London Street, felt that it would be ridiculous to locate a parking lot on the subject property. He stated that many people who work on Mission Street park their automobiles on London Street; and, if the proposed parking lot were to be approved, it would be used by customers of the bank and not by the bank's employees. In any case, a parking lot had

7/2/70

already been provided for the banks on Norton Street; and it is never filled to capacity. Many children play on London Street, and many other children use the street to get to the three schools located in the area. Under the circumstances, he felt that the proposed parking lot would be a definite safety hazard.

Steve Salvi, representing his father who owns property at 100 Excelsior Avenue, supported the residents of the neighborhood who had spoken in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that the proposed bank building would have a floor area of more than 5,000 square feet; and, as a result, 14 parking spaces would be required by the City Planning Code. Since the proposed parking lot would provide space for only 10 automobiles, it was apparent that the proposed facility would have to be redesigned even if the parking lot were to be approved. He noted that the Civic Center Branch of the Wells Fargo Bank had just initiated a policy of renting parking spaces to the general public; and, under the circumstances, he felt that there was no doubt but what the proposed parking lot, also, would be used by individuals other than the customers of the bank. Therefore, the proposed parking lot would increase the vehicular activity in an otherwise residential neighborhood and pose a safety hazard for children in the area. Furthermore, use of the site for a parking lot would result in the removal of seven housing units which would be difficult to replace and which would add to the already serious housing shortage of the City. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

Mr. Fiore stated that he did not take issue with the statements made by the individuals who had spoken in opposition to the application; however, he felt that most of the problems could be resolved if the plans for the facility could be modified through consultation with the staff of the Department of City Planning. He believed that it would be possible to revise the pattern for access and egress; and an electric arm could be installed which would be raised only on the approach of an automobile. He stated that the buildings occupying the site presently house only five tenants; and he indicated that the hobby shop which had been mentioned by one of the previous speakers had already given notice that it intended to terminate its lease. While people who live in the neighborhood might be satisfied with the present location of the Wells Fargo Bank, he believed that people who live further away might find the new location to be more convenient. While people working on Mission Street have parked their automobiles on London Street, that has always been a problem because the cars are often vandalized; therefore, the proposed parking lot would have private police control. The parking lot would be closed by a gate after 4:30 P.M.; and children living in the neighborhood could play in the lot after that time. He felt that residents of the neighborhood should be excited by the fact that the bank wished to spend \$500,000 in their area because the area will deteriorate if

7/2/70

investments are not made. He indicated that he would be willing to consider the possibility of reducing the number of parking spaces in the lot from 10 to 7; and, if the Committee so desired, it might be possible to place residential units on top of the proposed bank building. In any case, if the people who were to be dislocated by the bank could not find new housing immediately, he would be willing to agree in writing that the existing buildings would not be demolished until the people have been relocated.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried unanimously that Resosution No. 6566 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CURRENT MATTERS (Cont.)

Commissioner Porter moved the adoption of a draft resolution which she had prepared which would request the Board of Supervisors to place on the ballot again a bond issue proposal for acquisition of the Cliff House-Sutro Baths properties for public open space. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Newman.

Commissioner Miller advised the Commission that the deadline had already passed for submission of bond issue proposals to be included on the November ballot. Since there will be no election in June, 1971, he estimated that the earliest possible date for resubmission to the voters of the bond issue being proposed would be in November, 1971.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the lower portion of the Sutro Baths property could and should be developed without destroying views; and he did not see any advantage in recommending a bond issue which could not be put before the voters for 1½ years.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Commission should go on record in support of public acquisition of the Cliff House-Sutro Baths property; and he did not feel that adoption of the draft resolution would be harmful to anyone.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted 6-1 to adopt Resolution No. 6567 requesting the Board of Supervisors to place on the ballot again a bond issue proposal for acquisition of the Cliff House-Sutro Baths properties for public open space. Commissioners Finn, Kearney, Miller, Newman, Porter, and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioner Fleishhacker voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Wednesday, July 8, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Wednesday, July 8, 1970, at 7:30 P.M. in Room 282 City Hall.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Walter S. Newman, Vice President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James K. Carr, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Dennis Ryan, Planner III - Urban Design; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Marshall Schwartz represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

CONSIDERATION OF PLANS FOR PROPOSED SCHOOL TO BE LOCATED ON THE EL POLIN SITE IN THE PRESIDIO

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reviewed the series of action which had been taken with regard to the school proposed for the El Polin site over the past several years. He stated that the project dated back to June 5, 1964, when the Board of Education had approved a resolution permitting their Superintendent to apply for Federal assistance in providing educational facilities for Presidio-based children. On October 2, 1967, the Superintendent of Schools had sent a letter to the Department of City Planning advising that an agreement had been reached between the Board of Education and the Presidio to lease the 10-acre Lobos Creek site and the 10.5-acre El Polin site for construction of schools. Subsequently, on February 3, 1969, the General Administrative Officer of the School District and members of the neighborhood requested the Department of City Planning to review the acceptability of the two Presidio locations for school development. On May 6, 1969, the report of the Department of City Planning was submitted to the Superintendent of Schools indicating that the Lobos Creek site appeared to be appropriate but questioning the acceptability of the El Polin site unless certain specific design terms of reference were met. A committee of the Commission was formed to review the matter; and, on May 29, 1969, the committee submitted a report to the full Commission which recommended that the Lobos Creek site be developed first and that alternatives to the El Polin site within the Presidio be explored further by the staff of the Department of City Planning. The Commission then learned that enrollment projections previously used by the school district and the Commission committee had differed from those which had been used by the Army and

7/8/70

that the Army had decided to give first priority to construction of the El Polin School; thus, the Commission voted on July 3, 1969, to rescind all recommendations previously made except that the Lobos Creek site would be appropriate for a school and that the first school should be located on that site. The Commission also requested the staff of the Department of City Planning to review other potential sites within the Presidio which might be acceptable for the construction of a school. Five additional sites were surveyed which seemed to meet the basic requirements of the school district since they were located on the easterly and southerly peripheries of the Presidio and would thus be accessible to children living in the Presidio and in adjacent communities; however, all five sites were determined to be unsuitable for school construction. As a result, the Commission voted on July 17, 1969, to declare the El Polin site acceptable providing that it were expanded in size and providing that the design terms of reference previously established by the Commission were met by any school proposed for the site; however, the Commission emphasized that the Lobos Creek School site, also acceptable, should be built on first. On August 5, 1969, the Board of Education approved the El Polin site and proceeded to establish a committee to recommend an architect for the project. Martin Rosse was selected.

The Director stated that he had received a request from the Board of Education on June 10, 1970, to review and comment upon the drawings which had been prepared for the El Polin School. He had then prepared a memorandum re-stating the Commission's design terms of reference and indicating how the schematic design for the school conformed or failed to conform to the design terms of reference. The memorandum was transmitted to the Board of Education on June 17 and was distributed to the City Planning Commission on June 18. At that time, the City Planning Commission decided to hold a special meeting on July 8 for public review of the Presidio School sites issue. During the interim, the Director had corresponded with the architect for the proposed school and had received a revised set of plans which, in his opinion, met the design terms of reference which had previously been established by the Commission; and he was prepared to recommend that those plans be approved. Concluding his remarks, the Director emphasized that the review of school sites in the Presidio had not come before the Commission as a mandatory referral. The Commission had been asked to make recommendations to the Board of Education; and additional recommendations could be made. However, the Board of Education could in turn either accept or disregard the advice of the Commission. Because the participants in the issue of the school sites are the Army, the Unified School District and the community, the principal purpose to be served by the meeting currently in progress would be to provide a platform for all individuals involved to express their concerns.

Wilbert Vestnys, Assistant Superintendent of the Unified School District, summarized the steps which had been taken by the Board of Education to obtain grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for construction of schools on Treasure Island and the Presidio. He stated the H.E.W. had approved a grant of \$538,000 for construction of a school in the Presidio; and, following the receipt of those funds, the Board of Education had proceeded to prepare plans for construction of a school on the El Polin site. Although the site was first selected by the Army, he considered it to be an excellent site for a school since it would allow nature studies to be held in a natural setting; and he did not believe that

the buildings which had been designed for the site would be objectionable. He remarked that the need for a school in the Presidio has been obvious for a long time; and, while the number of students attending elementary schools in San Francisco has decreased slightly in recent years, the new emphasis on smaller classes has placed great demands on the amount of classroom space available. Therefore, if new schools could be constructed in the Presidio, the overcrowded situation in other nearby schools could be relieved. Mr. Vestnys stated that Mr. Burke was present in the audience to represent the Army. Mr. Rosse, the architect for the El Polin School, was also present. All of them would be willing to answer any questions which the Commission might have regarding the proposed school.

Commissioner Newman asked if all other alternate sites in the Presidio had been considered and if a determination had been made that no other site would be acceptable for construction of a school. Mr. Vestnys replied that to the best of his knowledge all other possible sites had been reviewed and found to be unacceptable.

Commissioner Porter, remarking that the City Planning Commission had gone on record with a recommendation that the first school to be constructed should be built on the Lobos Creek site, asked why the Board of Education and the Army had decided to give first priority to the El Polin School. Mr. Vestnys replied that the Army had requested that the El Polin site be developed first.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Board of Education had obtained a firm commitment from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that funds would be provided for the proposed school. Mr. Vestnys replied in the affirmative stating that \$538,000 had already been received and that the remainder, covering approximately \$1,000,000 total estimated cost of the proposed school, would be received in the future. However, although the Federal Government will pay for the school buildings themselves, San Francisco will bear responsibility for staffing and operating the school once it has been completed.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the Director had indicated that five alternate sites which were shown on a map in the meeting room had been reviewed and had been found to be unacceptable, asked if any other sites in the Presidio had been considered. Mr. Vestnys replied in the negative, indicating that the areas east of Lobos Creek which might have been considered had even poorer access than the five alternate sites which had been considered because of the creek.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that it was his opinion that the sites which had been considered were not the only sites available within the Presidio which would be acceptable for school use. Mr. Vestnys replied that to the best of his knowledge the sites which had been considered were the only ones which would meet the criteria established by the Federal Government.

Commissioner Ritchie asked for a comparison of the number of children from the Presidio and the number of children from outside the Presidio who could be accommodated in the proposed school to be constructed on the El Polin site. Mr. Vestnys replied that local children will be allowed to attend the proposed school only if seats are available after children living on the Presidio have been accommodated. In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Ritchie, Mr. Vestnys stated that the proposed school will accommodate from 650-750 children.

7/8/70

Commissioner Ritchie asked how many Army children presently attend the Sherman School. Mr. Vestnys replied that approximately 383 of the children who had attended the Sherman School during the last semester had lived in the neighborhood; and approximately 406 children had been bused to the school from other areas. He did not know precisely how many children attending the school had come from the Presidio; however, he estimated that approximately one-half of the 859 children living on the Presidio had walked or been taken by their parents to adjacent schools during the last school year.

Miss Hume, 3355 Pacific Avenue, stated that it was her understanding that the money which had already been received from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would be used to construct a child care center on the El Polin site which would accommodate children from two years through kindergarten age. Because of the traffic pattern on Arguello Boulevard and Pacific Avenue, and because of the age group which would be accommodated on the site during the first phase of the program, the site seemed to her to be inappropriate.

After Commissioner Porter had requested clarification of the points raised by Miss Hume, Mr. Vestnys stated that the primary effort of the Board of Education would be to construct classrooms on the site; and he indicated that neither an all-purpose room nor a cafeteria would be constructed initially. He assumed that the classrooms would be used for children enrolled in kindergarten and the first and second grades and doubted that any classrooms would be used for a child care center; however, the Board of Education would have to work closely with the Army to determine how the space in the new building would be used.

Commissioner Porter then asked about the overall cost of the proposed project. Mr. Vestnys replied that the project would probably cost slightly more than one million dollars. In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Porter as to the freedom which the Board of Education would have in using the funds being obtained from H.E.W., Mr. Vestnys stated that the basic concern of H.E.W. was that the school be used for children in kindergarten through the sixth grade.

Miss Hume stated that she had received a letter from Mr. Soso, Chairman of the Elementary School Building Committee, advising her that his committee had voted to build Phase IV of the project first in order to give emphasis to construction of the child care center.

Mr. Soso, who was present in the audience, stated that his committee had favored construction of classrooms and a child care center since the Army had exercised its prerogative in insisting that a child care center should be constructed on the site.

Miss Hume stated that she was under the impression that the Presidio already has a child care center; and, if another facility were to be constructed on the school site, she wondered what age group of children would be accommodated. Mr. Burke, representing the Army, stated that the Presidio does have one child care center which is operated by parents in a condemned building; however, 75 children are taken to child care centers outside of the Presidio.

7/8/70

Mr. Binns, representing the Presidio Society, stated that the specific proposal for construction of a school in the Presidio had originated in 1964; and, since that date, both the Board of Education and the City Planning Commission had given thorough consideration to the proposal. However, the problem of providing classroom space for children in the Presidio actually dated back to 1951. He pointed out that it was already 1970; and he felt that the fact that no school had yet been constructed was due in large part to confusion which had been created deliberately. He stated that he had received a mimeographed statement in the mail concerning the proposal to construct a school on the El Polin site; and he believed that the statement was full of inaccuracies and mistruths. The statement had claimed that the proposed school would destroy the view from Vista Point; however, since the highest rooftop of the proposed school would be 35 feet below the level of Vista Point, he felt that the claim which had been made was patently false. The statement had also remarked that a number of trees would be lost because of the proposed construction project; but it had failed to mention that it is the policy of the Presidio to plant ten new trees for every tree which is removed. The statement had also objected to the destruction of the forest by an asphalt road and the ruination of a leading recreation area; yet, the road had been in existence for almost three years, and no one had ever been permitted to camp in the Presidio. He also felt that some people are under the assumption that the proposed school would be controlled by the Federal Government since it is located in the Presidio; however, the fact of the matter is that the property has been leased to the Board of Education which will operate the school. Also, some people had believed that the school would be used only by Army children; and he had understood that a certain capacity of the school would be filled by children from the Presidio and that children from other parts of the city could attend the school if space is available. Whether space will be available or not would be difficult to predict since no one knows what the troop strength of the Presidio might be four or five years in the future. In conclusion, he stated that the purpose of his organization is to preserve the Presidio in the status quo; and, as a result, he felt that no one was more concerned about the character of the developments in the Presidio than the members of his group.

John Jacobs, representing the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that it was his personal opinion that the proposed school would ruin the view from Vista Point because people would then see buildings instead of green grass and trees. He indicated that he had participated in reviewing sites for the proposed school; but he emphasized that the El Polin site had always been a matter of controversy and that it had never been accepted by the community. An effort had been made to encourage the Army to consider other alternate sites for the school; but the Army had always insisted that there were no other sites available. Thus, the El Polin site had been expanded and work had proceeded on plans for the new school. He felt that acceptance of a series of assumptions had led to a grave error; and, having realized that, a large number of people had come to the meeting now in progress to oppose construction of the school. He stated that the school would destroy valuable open space; and, since the Board of Education's lease on the property could be cancelled at any time on the whim of the Secretary of the Army, the school, as well as the open space, could be lost. Furthermore, construction of the proposed school would be in conflict with the policy stated by Mayor Alioto earlier in the year to the effect that existing open space which is to be used for buildings should be replaced by the demolition of older buildings and the creation

7/8/70

of new open space. Mr. Jacobs stated that the original decision to construct the proposed school had been made three or four years ago in a completely different atmosphere when people were unaware of the threats which would be made upon San Francisco's open spaces. Some of the threats subsequently made were as follows: expansion of the Veteran's Administration Hospital, construction of an Archives Building in Fort Miley, construction of a National Guard Training Center near Lobos Creek, the proposed Lobos Creek School, an office building for the Food and Drug Administration in the Presidio, the El Polin School, expansion of the Julius Kahn Playground, construction of "Walter Reed West", construction of 700 new units of housing in the Presidio, proposed trade of land at Fort Funston, and a proposal to trade Fort Mason for construction of a new office building. Taken by itself, the proposal to construct a school on the El Polin site might not seem too important; however, if the proposal were viewed in the context of all of the other actions proposed by the Federal Government, it could be considered as an incremental step toward the loss of all of the open spaces in San Francisco which are not owned by the City. Therefore, even though the subject site might not be within the purview of the City Planning Commission, he felt that it was the responsibility of the Commission to try to protect the site as a valuable portion of the City's open space.

Mr. Jacobs read from a letter which had been addressed to Stanley H. Sinton, Jr., President of SPUR, by G. Douglas Hofe, Jr., Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the United States Department of the Interior, as follows:

"In response to your letter of June 9 regarding construction plan for Fort Miley, I am pleased to inform you that Secretary Hickel has written to the General Services Administration requesting that a moratorium be placed on any construction or disposal action planned by that agency for Fort Miley and other Federal lands being considered by this Department for inclusion in its Golden Gate National Recreation area. The Secretary has asked that the moratorium remain in effect until our Golden Gate study has been completed and the President's Property Review Board has had an opportunity to review our recommendations. We expect that the study will be completed by September 1, 1970."

Mr. Jacobs was confident that the Golden Gate National Recreation area will become a reality, thus obviating the need for continuing arguments over the use of Federal land on a parcel-by-parcel basis; and he advised the Commission that he had been advised by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that the El Polin site would be included in the Golden Gate National Recreation area.

Peter Christelman, representing San Francisco Tomorrow, stated that the public as a whole had become acutely aware of the danger posed to our environment by the possible loss of open space since the El Polin School issue previously had been considered by the Commission; and, in fact, President Nixon had called for a re-assessment of the uses proposed for Federal property. He felt that the Commission should re-evaluate its previous decision regarding the El Polin site. While he recognized that a great deal of time and money had been spent on the project, he felt that those should be considered minor factors in comparison with the possibility of losing one of the few wilderness-like areas in the city. If a decision

7/8/70

were made now that a school should not be built on the site, the time and money which had been spent would seem of no consequence whatsoever in the future. Furthermore, in view of the fact that there is a strong possibility that a Golden Gate National Recreation area will be established which might include the subject site, he felt that it would be desirable for the Commission to reverse its former position and to state that construction of a school on the El Polin site would be unacceptable to the citizens of San Francisco.

David Gast, representing the Environment Workshop, stated that the members of his organization were opposed to construction of a school on the El Polin site even if the school being proposed would conform to the design terms of reference which had previously been established by the Commission. He remarked that there should be priorities for construction of new schools; and he felt that it should be obvious that the Presidio and the Pacific Heights neighborhood are not the areas that are most in need of additional school facilities. In fact, if the El Polin School were to be constructed, it might not be needed when it is completed. Regardless of the school issue, it was his opinion that no further development of land in the Presidio should take place until a Master Plan has been prepared for the entire post. He advised the Commission that his organization had held a meeting which had been attended by more than 500 citizens who had signed a petition urging a moratorium on construction in the Presidio until such time as a Master Plan, in fact as well as in title, has been prepared by the Army. Most importantly, however, he felt that if new buildings are to be constructed in the Presidio, they should be built in areas which are already developed rather than on land which has formerly served as open space. He noted that President Nixon, in his environmental address, had given priority to acquisition of lands now which will be needed for open space in the future. Under the circumstances, he urged that all new construction in the Presidio be halted until such time as a Master Plan has been prepared for the Post and until a final position is made with regard to the establishment of a Golden Gate National Recreation area.

Richard Goldman, representing the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors and the Citizen's Action Committee for the Presidio, stated that the people who were present in the audience felt a dedication to the future. He estimated that the population of the Bay Area will triple in size during the next 50 years; and, given the problems of pollution and environment which are already having to be faced, he felt that the City Planning Commission should do everything possible to protect existing open space. He remarked that the Presidio is largely devoted to open space; and he was grateful to the Army for its role in maintaining it in that state. However, in view of uses which have been proposed for Federally-owned open space in San Francisco recently, he felt that careful consideration should be given to proposals such as the one presently under discussion. Mr. Goldman stated that he had spoken with General Larsen of the Presidio the preceding evening, and had been advised that the General would have no objection to abandoning the proposal for construction of a school in the Presidio if the Board of Education so desires since children from the Presidio have been accommodated satisfactorily in schools elsewhere in the community for a number of years. Mr. Goldman felt that the principal objective which everyone wished to obtain is to provide classrooms for the children of San Francisco; and he felt that the \$1,000,000 which the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had committed to construction of a school in the Presidio should be used to construct a school in Hunters Point so that

7/8/70

children would not have to be bused from that neighborhood to other areas of the city. Children living on the Presidio could continue to be accommodated in existing local schools. He felt that such a program would be more valuable than the one under consideration; and he believed that it would more closely represent the general sentiment of the community.

Frederic Selinger, representing the Citizen's Action Committee for the Presidio, stated that his organization had circulated leaflets to advise the public of the present meeting and had asked the recipients of the leaflets to clip and send an attached coupon to the City Planning Commission urging that the El Polin site be protected. He wondered how many of the coupons had been received.

President Kearney stated that he had received approximately 288 coupons plus four telegrams.

Mr. Selinger stated that he had also received a telegram from Supervisor Roger Boas as follows:

"Heartiest congratulations on your excellent organizational work to stop any further development in the Presidio. I support your stand 100%. I regret that I will be on vacation on July 8 but promise you my full support."

Mr. Selinger also remarked that the Board of Education had stated that the El Polin site would be a desirable location for a school since it would provide an excellent opportunity for teaching children about the out-of-doors. But he felt that it would be ironic to cut down trees to achieve that purpose. He also questioned Mr. Binns' statement that the rooftop of the highest building in the school complex would be 35 feet below the elevation of Inspiration Point and asked if the staff of the Department of City Planning could clarify that issue. The Director replied that the elevation of the roof of the children's center, the highest building in the complex, would be approximately 275 feet. The elevation of Inspiration Point is approximately 280 feet.

Mr. Selinger stated that the figures cited by the Director indicated that the roof of the highest school building would be only 5 feet below Inspiration Point. He noted that it is possible to walk for blocks and blocks in San Francisco without seeing any greenery of trees; and, under the circumstances, it seemed to him to be incredible that serious consideration was being given to the possibility of bulldozing trees and ruining views which presently exist. He remarked that many people were present in the audience who do not customarily attend meetings of the City Planning Commission; and he felt that they were present because they are scared about the prospect of urban pollution. With regard to the Army's willingness to cooperate, he called attention to the fact that both the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors had pleaded with the Presidio for a small piece of property next to the Marina Green for construction of a sewage treatment plant, but the request had been denied by the Presidio and by the Army on appeal. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that the Army had expressed a willingness to cooperate with the City in an effort to preserve existing amenities. Mr. Selinger stated that San Francisco needs trees and schools, not trees or schools; and he felt that the proposed school could

7/8/70

be located on another site. While he realized that it would be difficult to start again to prepare plans for a new school in a different location, he felt that such an approach should be taken because of the importance of preserving the El Polin site.

Robert Katz, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, an organization with a membership of approximately 600 people, remarked that the Director of Planning had previously been impressed with a question raised by a woman during a meeting of the City Planning Commission asking "What will we tell our children when we are asked why we did this?"; and he felt that it would be equally appropriate to ask the same question with reference to the proposal presently under consideration. He noted that the Army had not given any reasons why the proposed school could not be located on another site within the Presidio; and, as a result, he felt that the decision to construct the school on the El Polin site must have been made arbitrarily. He noted that when the Army builds an airplane or ship which fails to meet the purpose for which it was constructed, the airplane or ship is put in mothballs or dumped; and he felt that unwise proposals such as the one presently being considered should be treated in the same manner. The proposal for constructing a new Southern Crossing on San Francisco Bay is being reconsidered at the present time because people are thinking in terms of tomorrow; and it seemed to him that the proposal to locate a school on the El Polin site in the Presidio should be reconsidered, also. Apparently, consideration had been given to the possibility of constructing a school on the El Polin site since 1957. However, a child who had been six years old at that time would now be 19 years old and, possibly, a member of the Army. Furthermore, other events, such as the proposal for a Golden Gate Headlands recreational area, had recently arisen; and he felt that such factors should warrant reconsideration of the proposal to construct a school on the El Polin site. Mr. Katz felt that John Jacobs, Executive Director of SPUR, had presented the best arguments against construction of the proposed school; and, if such a decision were made by the Commission, he felt that it would be incumbent on everyone, including the Army, to work together to solve the problem of finding a suitable site for the new school.

Donald McHenry, a resident of the Richmond District, asked who holds title to the El Polin site. The Director replied that the site is owned by the Army.

Mr. McHenry then remarked that it was obvious that the Army could proceed to cut down the trees on the site if it so desired; and, under the circumstances, he suggested that the City Planning Commission and the Board of Education should not cooperate with the Army.

Mrs. Hans Klussmann, representing San Francisco Beautiful, felt that all of the decisions which had been made to date regarding the proposed school had been made in the spirit of good will. Yet, having taken a field trip through the Presidio, she was convinced that there are at least five alternate sites which would be more suitable for the proposed school than the one presently under consideration. She stated that she was confused about the financial arrangements being made for the school and wondered what would happen if the Department of Health, Education and Welfare were not willing to give the City the additional \$500,000 which will be needed to cover construction costs. In any case, the City would have to pay for

7/8/70

the staffing and operation of the school; and, as a result, she felt that the City should be able to influence the location of the school. Although money and time had already been spent to prepare plans for a school on the El Polin site, she felt that it would not be wise to proceed with the project if it were apparent that it were a mistake to recommend the use of the site for that purpose.

Robert P. Lilienthal, 1 Spruce Street, stated that he had served on the committee which had selected the architect for the proposed project. While he had a high regard for the architect, he felt that he had been saddled with an impossible job; and, as a result, the school buildings which were being proposed would destroy the existing forest. Mr. Lilienthal noted that the City Planning Commission had adopted design terms of reference for development of the site, and he felt that the Commission and the staff had an obligation to see that those guidelines would be met by any buildings to be constructed on the site; yet, when 50 architects were competing for the job of designing the building, most of them had not been aware that the design terms of reference had existed. If the architects had been familiar with the design terms of reference, they would probably have stated that it was doubtful that the guidelines could be met. In reaching a decision on the matter under discussion, it would be easy for the Commission to state that it has no control over actions taken by the Army in the Presidio; yet, on at least one occasion in the past, the community was able to stop the construction of new housing in the Presidio. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should not accept the position that it has no power to influence the Army's decision to construct a school on the El Polin site.

Mr. Lilienthal also wondered if the City Planning Commission would approve the plans for the proposed facility as being in conformity with the Master Plan if the Board of Education and the Army should decide to proceed with the project. He recalled that Commissioner Porter had been instrumental in having the subject portion of the Presidio included in a "green belt" with public zoning; and, theoretically, nothing should be constructed on property so designated without the specific approval of the City Planning Commission. Therefore, he felt that it would be extremely important for the Commission to refuse to certify the plans for the school as being in conformity with the Master Plan since such a refusal would give the community a strong weapon in their fight to prevent construction of the school. He stated that at least one former Commissioner, an attorney, was of the opinion that the Commission does legally have the authority to prevent the construction of undesirable buildings on land owned by the Army; and he felt that the authority should be exercised in the present instance. However, if the Commission were not willing to state that the school should not be constructed on the site, he hoped that the Commission would at least be willing to require that any construction on the site be in conformity with the design terms of reference which had previously been adopted.

Mr. Lilienthal stressed the fact that the forest on the southern portion of the Presidio does extend continuously from the Julius Kahn Playground to Arguello Boulevard; and he indicated that the area is used by groups such as the Boy Scouts for camping and by other citizens for barbecues or relaxation. He believed that construction of the parking lot for the school would destroy the forest. Therefore, in order to preserve the area for the enjoyment of the citizens of San Francisco, he felt that the Commission should take the position that the school should be located on another site. However, of the five alternate sites which had been con-

7/8/70

sidered by the staff of the Department of City Planning, one is more heavily wooded than the El Polin site, another will be required for the expansion of Letterman Hospital, and a third would be costly to bulkhead; furthermore, the survey had been restricted to sites on the perimeter of the Presidio at the request of the Army. He believed that the alternate sites which had been reviewed were in fact "straw horses"; and he believed that a satisfactory site could be found within the Presidio if a real effort were made by all parties concerned. While he realized that the Army does serve as the custodian for the Presidio, he emphasized that the Presidio belongs to the people of the United States; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the people should have the opportunity to state how the property will be used.

Joseph W. Burke, DAC, Post Director GED, after listening to the foregoing speakers, wondered who the "whipping boy" would be when California drops into the ocean during the next earthquake. He stated that the Army has paid the City of San Francisco \$350.00 for each child from the Presidio attending school; and, in addition, the Army has paid \$175.00 for each child attending local schools who belongs to someone working on the Presidio. Therefore, over the past 20 years, the Presidio has paid the City of San Francisco more than \$2 million dollars to cover the expense of educating children from the Presidio. At the present time, more than 900 students from the Presidio are attending classes in eight local schools. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare had agreed to allocate \$1,200,000 for construction of a new school in the Presidio; and, if plans for the school cannot be completed, funds will have to be made available to bus students from the Presidio to other schools. Furthermore, if the funds offered by H. E.W. are not used for construction of a school in the Presidio, they would be lost since they could not be used for a school in Hunters Point or any other section of the City. He noted that the citizens of San Francisco are opposed to the bussing of students; yet, at the same time, they complain about overcrowded classrooms. Under the circumstances, he felt that the proposal to construct two new schools in the Presidio should be received favorably by the City.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Army would continue to pay the City for the education of children from the Presidio if the proposed school were to be constructed. Mr. Burke replied in the affirmative.

Elizabeth Cannon asked what she could tell her children if they were to ask what happened to the forest if the school were to be constructed.

Mrs. Emmons, representing the San Francisco Chapter of the Sierra Club, an organization which has 20,000 members in the Bay Area, stated that the need for preserving open space is even more important now than ever before. She remarked that the potential loss of a great deal of valuable open space in San Francisco had resulted in serious consideration being given to the establishment of a Golden Gate National Recreation area. And, since the El Polin site would be a valuable element of that project, she felt that the proposed school should not be constructed. In conclusion, she stated that once open space is developed, it can never be replaced in terms of quantity or quality.

7/8/70

Mr. Mohun stated that he represented his nine youngsters, all of whom attend school at St. Vincent de Paul along with youngsters from the Presidio, and he understood that they had requested him to come before the Commission to urge that the existing situation not be changed.

Jack Amescoli, Administrative Assistant to Russell R. Miller, Democratic Candidate for San Francisco's Sixth Congressional District, read the following statement which had been prepared by Mr. Miller:

"I used to live a block away from the Presidio, so I join you in your efforts to halt the needless destruction of beautiful land. I believe that we must not allow one more foot of Presidio land to be paved over. If there are genuine needs, such as a new elementary school, let the Army destroy old buildings and build new ones as an indication of their concern for the environment.

"The proposed construction site would destroy some of the most beautiful sights in San Francisco. The site is also near the Julius Kahn Playground. What will happen to the playground when hundreds of cars come to pick the children up every day.

"My Grandfather, John J. Barrett, resigned as President of the Presidio Golf Club because of the Military's intransigence about new construction.

"In the family tradition, I believe that open space must be preserved at all costs. It is my understanding that there are many alternate sites, for instance, the old Cavalry Stables near a beautiful hollow about one and one-half minutes from the proposed site. We must not allow this beautiful land to be destroyed by inconsiderate Military officials."

Commissioner Newman, noting that Mr. Vestnys had stated that the proposed school could be used by local children only when all children from the Presidio have been accommodated, asked when, if ever, the school might have room for local children. Mr. Vestnys replied that there are presently 850 children on the Presidio; and that figure is subject to change at any time depending on the size of families living on the Post. Under the circumstances, he expected that both of the schools proposed for the Presidio will have to be constructed with a combined capacity of 1400 children before classroom space in either of the schools can be made available to local children.

Commissioner Newman then asked the Director if he were correct in his recollection that the Master Plan for the Presidio had indicated that additional housing units were being contemplated. The Director replied in the affirmative, indicating that approximately 600 or 700 additional housing units had been projected on the Master Plan. He noted, however, that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the new housing units not be constructed on property which has served as open space.

7/8/70

Commissioner Newman remarked that construction of the new housing might increase the child population of the Presidio to a level sufficient to fill both of the new schools being proposed; and, under those circumstances, the local children might never be able to attend the schools.

Mr. Burke stated that construction of the new housing might increase the child population of the Presidio to approximately 1500 if one were to accept the demographic figure of 1.3 children for each family living on the Post. Yet, while the child population is subject to fluctuations, he thought that it was reasonable to expect that most of the space in the proposed schools would be required for the education of children from the Post.

Commissioner Newman, remarking on the fact that the two schools being proposed would more than likely be used only by children from the Presidio, questioned the Army's decision to require the schools to be located on the perimeter of the Presidio instead of on other sites located nearer to the housing in which the children live. Since the schools would not be used by local children, the Army's decision to require that they be located on the perimeter of the Presidio would result in an infringement of the rights of citizens of San Francisco; and he felt that the Commission's previous decision to approve the two sites should be reconsidered.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had been a member of the Commission committee which had previously reviewed the proposal for construction for the school on the El Polin site; and she indicated that she was sympathetic with the position of the Board of Education, the Army, and the staff of the Department of City Planning who had tried to lessen the impact of the proposed buildings. She had reluctantly voted to approve construction of a school on the site in the belief that the "so-called" design terms of reference which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning would make the school less detrimental in its impact on the site. However, she had made another field trip to the site within the last few days; and, given the size of the facility and the fact that a large parking lot was being proposed in a forested area, she felt that construction of the school would result in the ruination of one of the major entrances to the Presidio. She stated that she had made a mistake when she first voted to approve construction of a school on the site; and she now felt that the site should be preserved for all of the citizens of San Francisco, hopefully as a part of the proposed Golden Gate National Recreational area.

President Kearney, remarking that several citizens had inferred that the Army is the "whipping boy" in the issue under consideration, stated that his own feeling is that the Army is not the enemy. He believed that General Larsen is trying to be as cooperative as possible with the community since we are his neighbors; and he was convinced that General Larsen personally has close affection for the Presidio and has a desire to see it preserved for posterity with as much open space as possible.

7/8/70

Neither did he regard the Board of Education as being the enemy. He stated that the Board of Education, which has responsibility for providing school-age children with an education, has financial problems; and, as a result, many of their policies are dictated by Federal agencies which give money with strings attached, leaving the Board of Education with little room to maneuver.

The true enemy, in his opinion, is a state of mind, such as when people become discouraged and feel that they cannot fight the establishment. Yet, when the Board of Supervisors had requested the City Planning Commission to review commercial development proposed for Alcatraz Island, the Commission had taken the position that the island should be kept for open space; and, subsequently, local pressure had resulted in a decision being made in Washington that Alcatraz Island will not be developed commercially. Similarly, the General Services Administration had proposed to construct a "warehouse" for the Federal archives on Fort Miley; and, while there had been a general feeling that nothing could be done to prevent the construction of that building, SPUR and the citizens of San Francisco had been successful in persuading the Secretary of the Interior to halt the plans for construction of that building. Under the circumstances, he felt that it should be obvious that it is possible to fight the establishment and to win.

President Kearney also remarked that some agencies have a tendency to do their own planning first and then to submit their proposals to the City Planning Commission under circumstances in which the Commission can only establish guidelines to ameliorate a catastrophe; and he felt that such situations were regrettable. Yet, many things have happened in the last few months, the most significant change of all being the new atmosphere in Washington. The magic word today is "ecology", the term for a concept as old as time which has recently become more important than "motherhood". The change in Washington was evident both in the quotation which a previous speaker had read from President Nixon's Environment Address and from Secretary Hickel's support of the proposal for establishment of a Golden Gate National Headlands Park. Therefore, it is obvious that things do change; and, if the true enemy is a state of mind, a feeling of hopelessness, the citizens of San Francisco and the City Planning Commission should have confidence in their power to assert themselves to prevent loss of a valuable portion of open space. He felt that the Commission has the "muscle" to prevail; and he believed that the Commission should assume a role of leadership in the present instance by recommending that no school be constructed on the El Polin site in the Presidio.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the Commission should first make a determination as to whether the plans for the school which had been submitted do meet the design guidelines which had previously been established by the Commission. He stated that he believed that many of the comments which had been made during the course of the hearing had not been factual. Some speakers had made statements to the effect that the construction of the school would destroy a forest; yet, as a matter of fact, a forest would be created. Furthermore, the school would not destroy any views from Inspiration Point since people enjoying views do not look down at their feet. He felt that the City would be very fortunate to obtain a new school with funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and he regarded the plans which had been submitted for the proposed school to be of high quality. If the Commission were to recommend that the school not be built on the El Polin

7/8/70

site, the matter of providing school facilities for the children living on the Presidio, who are no different from other children living in San Francisco, would still not be solved; and he felt that the Commission and the citizens of San Francisco should find a solution to that problem. He asked Mr. Vestnys what the plans of the Board of Education would be if the Commission should disapprove the site.

Mr. Vestnys stated that since the Presidio is within the boundaries of the San Francisco School District, the Board of Education is bound to furnish an education for the children living on the Presidio. Therefore, if new schools are not constructed on the Presidio, children living on the Post will have to be accommodated in existing local schools on a continuing basis. However, in view of the current policy to lower the number of students in the classrooms and to introduce other activities into the schools, space in the schools is becoming scarce. If funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are not used to construct schools in the Presidio, the Board of Education would probably have two alternative courses of action. The first alternative would be to continue bussing school children and to place them in overcrowded classrooms; the second alternative would be to construct a new school adjacent to the Presidio, a project which would be extremely expensive because it would involve the clearing of an entire block of housing.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Board of Education presently owns any unused property. Mr. Vestnys replied that the Board of Education does own various isolated parcels of unused property in the Sunset District; however, he indicated that no unused property is owned in the vicinity of the Presidio.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the issue which should be resolved by the Commission at the conclusion of the meeting was whether or not a school should be constructed on the El Polin site in the Presidio. He stated that he had visited the site 10 or 12 times during the last two weeks with members of the Commission and with Mayor Alioto. He had also thoroughly reviewed the plans which had been prepared for the proposed school; and he had noted that thousands of cubic yards of fill would have to be moved on the site to make construction of the school possible, starting at Arguello Boulevard and running deep into the forest. Furthermore, the playground for the proposed school would penetrate into the forest for a great distance, also. He stated that he had counted many trees which would have to be removed from the site as well as trees whose roots would be suffocated by the new fill; and while he conceded that trees may be replaced, he emphasized that it would take an awfully long time to replace some of the mature and and magnificent trees which would be lost. The school itself would consist of 36 conical rooflets, one of which would be located quite close to Arguello Boulevard; and, as a result, the school would destroy one of the most beautiful viewpoints in San Francisco as well as one of the two major entrances into the Presidio. He remarked that views in San Francisco are diagonal, inviting spectators to look down; and if one were to look down from Inspiration Point after construction of the proposed school, he would see a lot of rooftops. Commissioner Ritchie also remarked that the road which would lead to the proposed school would not be the existing quarry road but a new road running almost two blocks through the forest with a width of 24 feet; and the parking areas themselves would be 16 feet wide, making a total of 40 feet of roadwidth in the parking area. Another fact which had been denied by some of the previous speakers is the fact that the subject site is used every day by children playing, GI's resting, or by

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

1887. The subject of the present work is the history of the
 American people from the first settlement of the continent
 to the present time. It is a history of the people as
 they have lived, and as they are living, and as they
 are to live. It is a history of the people as they
 have been, and as they are, and as they are to be.

7/8/70

people merely enjoying the out-of-doors; and he felt that the site should be preserved in its present state for the enjoyment of future generations. He stated that there are a number of other locations in the Presidio which would be suitable for construction of a new school; however, those sites were not the ones which had been reviewed by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that he knew the location of other sites and emphasized that he is in the Real Estate business; and he felt that it would be up to the Army to find the sites and to proceed with construction of the school in another location if the Commission were to take the position that the subject site should not be developed with a school.

Commissioner Miller stated that if he had a choice between schools and open space, he would have to choose schools; however, he felt that the proposed school could be constructed in another location so that it would be possible to have both a school and open space in the present instance. He noted, however, that the citizens of San Francisco, in their wisdom, had voted down school bond issues in the last two elections; and he hoped that they would be willing to work as hard in the future for school bond issues as they had worked against the proposal for construction of a school on the El Polin site in the Presidio.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Ritchie that the City Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Education and the Department of the Army that no school be built on the El Polin site in the Presidio.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the Commission should remain in session after taking a vote on the motion in order to formulate a positive recommendation aimed at solving the problem of providing a new school for the Presidio.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5-1 to recommend to the Board of Education and the Department of the Army that no school be built on the El Polin site in the Presidio. Commissioners Kearney, Miller, Newman, Porter, and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioner Fleishhacker voted "No".

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the proposed school may still be constructed on the El Polin site in the Presidio in spite of the Commission's negative recommendation. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should address itself to the question of whether the plans which have been prepared for the school do meet the design terms of reference which had previously been adopted by the Commission. He then moved that the plans for the school be approved as in conformity with the design terms of reference.

Commissioner Newman asked the Director if the Board of Education's architect has succeeded in meeting the design terms of reference to the satisfaction of the staff. The Director replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Porter stated that she sympathized with the position being taken by Commissioner Fleishhacker; however, in view of the fact that the Commission had reconsidered its previous actions and had now recommended that no school be constructed on the El Polin site in the Presidio, it seemed to her that it would be confusing for the Commission to proceed to approve the plans for the school as

7/8/70

being in conformity with the guidelines which had previously been established. She suggested that the issue could be resolved by requesting the Secretary to reflect in the minutes the fact that the Director of Planning had stated that the plans which had been submitted for the school had complied with the Commission's design terms of reference.

Commissioner Ritchie asked the Director the following question: "If you were given complete responsibility for constructing a school in the Presidio, would you put it on the El Polin site?" The Director's reply was: "Based on everything I know now, yes."

President Kearney relinquished the Chair to Vice President Newman and offered an amendment to Commissioner Fleishhacker's motion which would have requested the Secretary to reflect in the minutes the fact that the Director of Planning had indicated that the plans for the proposed school had met the guidelines which had been established by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter then suggested that the best procedure might be to reword the motion already adopted by the Commission, as follows:

"Despite the fact that the plans which have been prepared for the proposed school by the Board of Education have met the guidelines set down by the City Planning Commission for the El Polin site, the City Planning Commission recommends to the Board of Education and the Department of the Army that no school be built on the site."

Commissioner Fleishhacker withdrew his motion, and Commissioner Kearney withdrew his amendment to that motion.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would not support Commissioner Porter's rewording of the action taken by the Commission since he did not believe that the plans which had been prepared for the proposed school did meet the guidelines which had been set by the Commission.

It was then moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried 5-1 that the Secretary be instructed to reflect in the record the fact that the Director of Planning had indicated that the plans which had been prepared for the proposed school had met the design terms of reference which had been established by the Commission. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Kearney, Miller, Newman and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the Board of Education already holds a lease for the Lobos Creek site, suggested that the Commission should give consideration to the appropriateness of locating a school on that site.

7/8/70

Commissioner Ritchie felt that it would not be proper to endorse construction of a school on the Lobos Creek site until the Commission has had an opportunity to hold another public meeting to hear from people who live adjacent to that portion of the Presidio.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that such a hearing should be held at the earliest possible date.

Commissioner Porter remarked that there had been no disagreement with the Lobos Creek site when the matter had previously been considered by the Commission; and, because of the necessity for finding an appropriate site in the Presidio for construction of a new school, she agreed with Commissioner Fleishhacker that a recommendation ought to be made regarding the alternate site as soon as possible.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried 5-1 that the Director be directed to give consideration to alternate sites for the school for the Presidio, giving particular attention to the Lobos Creek site, and to report to the Commission on the matter on an early date so that the Commission can decide if it should hold further public hearings to consider the desirability of an alternate site. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Kearney, Miller, Newman, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

... ..

[illegible]

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Thursday, July 9, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on July 9, 1970, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, Vice President; and James K. Carr, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; James Paul, Planner III - Housing Specialist; Trixie Ryan, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Cantor represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, announced that the BART staff will make a presentation at the Commission meeting on July 23 to show the advertising signs which will be installed on the mezzanine and BART platform levels in the San Francisco stations. Although the City Planning Commission and City ordinances do not control the placement of advertising in the underground BART Stations, this presentation has been requested by the Staff of the Department of City Planning to inform the Commission and the public at large of BART's policies.

The Director advised the Commission that there will be an open house in the Montgomery Street BART Station on July 26 from noon until 4:00 o'clock PM.

The Director noted that the Commission had previously adopted Resolution No. 6535 authorizing modifications in the Department of City Planning's contract with Whistler Patri Associates by deleting further work and contractual obligations pertaining to the Church and Castro Transit Station areas and by replacing these work elements by extending the West Portal area of study to include the design and traffic solution of the St. Francis Circle section; however, when the modified contract had been submitted to the Con-

DECLASSIFICATION
SCHEDULE

1. This document is classified "Secret" and is to be controlled as such.

2. This document is to be declassified and downgraded to "Confidential" on the date 10/1/90, unless it is determined that it contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification.

3. If it is determined that this document contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification, it shall be controlled as "Secret" until such time as the exemption is removed.

4. This document is to be declassified and downgraded to "Confidential" on the date 10/1/90, unless it is determined that it contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification.

5. If it is determined that this document contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification, it shall be controlled as "Secret" until such time as the exemption is removed.

6. This document is to be declassified and downgraded to "Confidential" on the date 10/1/90, unless it is determined that it contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification.

7. This document is to be declassified and downgraded to "Confidential" on the date 10/1/90, unless it is determined that it contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification.

8. If it is determined that this document contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification, it shall be controlled as "Secret" until such time as the exemption is removed.

9. This document is to be declassified and downgraded to "Confidential" on the date 10/1/90, unless it is determined that it contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification.

10. If it is determined that this document contains information that is exempt from automatic declassification, it shall be controlled as "Secret" until such time as the exemption is removed.

7/9/70

troller's Office, the Controller had requested that action be taken by the City Planning Commission to approve an extension of time for completion of the contract. Therefore, he had prepared a draft resolution for consideration by the Commission which would approve an extension of time for completion of the modified contract; and he recommended that the draft resolution be adopted. After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6569.

PUBLIC HEARING ON IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR RESIDENCE

President Kearney welcomed the audience to the first of a series of public meetings to be held for the purpose of receiving comments on the Improvement Plan for Residence. He stated that the Improvement Plan policies would be revised following the series of public meetings and would then be considered by the Commission for adoption as the housing element of San Francisco's Master Plan. He indicated, however, that the Commission did not intend to take any action at the conclusion of this first public meeting.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, commented upon the structure of the report which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that the report had been divided into three sections consisting of a brief analysis of housing need in San Francisco, a series of objectives and policies for residence, and specific recommendations for implementation of the objectives and policies. He emphasized, however, that only one section of the report, the section presenting a series of objectives and policies for residence, would be considered by the City Planning Commission for inclusion in the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco. In conclusion, he stated that the Mayor's Office, the Housing authority, the Human Rights Commission, the Redevelopment Agency, the Department of Public Works, and the Real Estate Department had reviewed and contributed to the Report; and representatives of most of those agencies were present in the audience.

Jeanette Sonaset, representing the Bernal Heights Association, stated that the members of the Board of Directors of her organization were very interested in the Report; however, most of them had not had an opportunity to review the Report in detail. She did indicate, however, that the members of her group strongly approved the emphasis on maintenance of the housing stock which was characteristic of the policies; and she also stated that members of her organization were quite interested in some of the specific sites which were proposed for new housing. A committee had been formed to study the report; however, the next meeting of the organization will not be held until September 2. In the meantime, she hoped that the staff of the Department of City Planning would be willing to prepare a display on the Improvement Plan for Residence for presentation at the Bernal Heights

7/9/70

Festival in August; and, in addition, she hoped that the Department of City Planning would accept an invitation to attend the next meeting of the Bernal Heights Association on September 2 to discuss the proposals. Following that meeting, her organization would prepare a position paper on the subject for submittal to the City Planning Commission.

Mrs. Jackie Yeager, representing residents of the Sunnyside District, stated that 960 signatures had been obtained in opposition to the FACE program which had been proposed for her neighborhood. She objected to the proposal contained in the Report that the density of areas in the vicinity of BART stations should be increased since there will be a BART station in the Sunnyside District; and she was not in favor of the proposal calling for construction of public housing in neighborhoods like hers which have little or no public housing at the present time. She stated that the residents of her neighborhood objected strongly to anything which would dictate to them what they must do with their homes. In conclusion, she stated that additional time would be necessary to enable residents of her neighborhood to review the report in detail; and, for that reason, she hoped that the Commission could defer action on the proposals until the fall.

The Director stated that he had already made recommendations to the Chief Administrative Officer for the FACE programs to be undertaken next year; and he indicated that he had not recommended that the Sunnyside area be designated as a FACE neighborhood.

Vernon Wallace, representing the Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside Community Association, Inc. (OMI), stated that Planning Area 13 as shown on maps contained in the report, while appearing to be a heterogeneous middle-class neighborhood, also includes St. Francis Wood within its boundary. Under the circumstances, if public housing were to be proposed for Planning Area 13, it would not be put in St. Francis Wood or near the ocean; rather, the bulk of the new public housing would inevitably be placed in the OMI area. Furthermore, the OMI neighborhood is an area in which the schools are already overcrowded.

Walter Knox, representing the Central City Citizen's Council, objected to the fact that the report had drawn a boundary at Howard Street and had made no provision for construction of new housing south of that point. In his opinion, the Central City area extends from Bush Street to Townsend Street and from the Embarcadero to 11th Street. He stated that the redevelopment project proposed for the South of Market area has created a need for relocation housing. Yet, no provision had been made within the redevelopment project area for construction of hotels; and only one senior citizen's center has been proposed for the area. He felt that the Redevelopment Agency is attempting to "freeze out" older people from the South of Market area; and an attempt had been made to keep the existing hotels half empty so that space will be available for relocation. People now living in the area wish

7/9/70

to remain; and they do not wish to be forced to move to areas which they cannot afford. Many of the people are on welfare; and their main desire is that their neighborhood should have places for them to live and small businesses to supply their daily needs. Mr. Knox felt that housing should be constructed on 4th, 5th and 6th Streets. He also remarked that when the 1970 Census is completed, it will verify that between 80,000 and 100,000 people live in the area which he represents; and, if those people were forced to relocate to other areas, they would probably have to pay at least \$2,000 more a year to live.

George Wolff, representing Tenants and Owners Opposition to Redevelopment (TOOR), advised the Commission that his organization has a case pending against the Redevelopment Agency in a Federal Court.

Emory Curtis, speaking as an individual, commended the staff for the "thoughtful and critical" report which had been prepared and distributed on the subject of housing. He stated that the problems of low- and moderate-income people are serious; and publication of the Improvement Plan for Residence by the Department of City Planning made them feel as if they might have found a friend. He believed that part of the problem stems from the fact that there is really no program to help people do not qualify for public housing but who are not at the middle-income level. He felt that the City should formulate goals to state what is wanted now and in the future; and it would be impossible to separate housing goals from other types of goals. He wondered what will happen to people from the Sunset District when they find that they can travel to downtown San Francisco from Orinda as quickly as from the Sunset District after BART is in operation; and he felt that plans should be made now to maintain and enhance the diversity of the city. He believed that FACE is a necessary program; however, it does not provide relocation assistance for people whom it displaces. He believed that the scattered site public housing policies recommended in the staff report should be followed; but he felt that "real backbone" on the part of the City fathers would be needed to implement that policy. Yet, no matter what is done, some people will raise objections. He agree completely with Policy No. 4 in the report which stated that reliance on property taxes as a municipal revenue source should be decreased; and he felt that a better vehicle should be sought for review of the report since it is difficult to obtain a consensus of opinion from public meetings such as the one now in process.

Charles Peterson, representing the Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association, stated that the housing committee of his organization had not yet had time to meet and to review the staff report; however, the members of his organization did have some concern regarding the proposals made in the report for Potrero Hill and the southeastern part of the city. He emphasized that the distribution of public housing in the city is presently concentrated in the southeastern part of the city. Potrero Hill already

7/9/70

has 645 units of public housing, or 17% of the units in the entire area. While the report recommended that Planning Area 9 would have a total of only 10.6% of the public housing existing or planned in the city, Planning Area 9 is in fact much larger than the Potrero Hill neighborhood. Furthermore, at least 17% of the housing on Potrero Hill is in the category of low-cost privately-owned housing. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that additional low-cost public housing should be constructed on Potrero Hill to meet the quota being recommended for Planning Area No. 9. He stated that he was particularly concerned about the staff's recommendation for construction of new housing on the Old Goat Farm; and he wondered about the boundaries of that site.

The Director stated that the Old Goat Farm is bounded by 19th, 20th, Carolina and Wisconsin Streets. Thus, the site is located north of the Wisconsin Street public housing site and overlooks downtown San Francisco. The staff had recommended that approximately 40 or 50 private market-rate housing units for families would be appropriate for the site; but the staff had not recommended use of the site for public housing.

Mr. Peterson stated that he considered the site to be an extension of the Wisconsin Street public housing site; and he believed that there would be pressures to use the site for public housing, especially since some of the people who already live in the housing project have expressed a desire to construct a new housing project in the area. He also noted that the staff report had recommended that the Redevelopment Agency undertake a feasibility study for housing on the Wisconsin Street site; but he felt that the site should be sold at public auction and developed with privately constructed housing. In conclusion, Mr. Peterson emphasized that the map contained on page 65 of the report showed that more than 3% of the housing in the eastern portion of the city is public housing; and, as a result, he felt that no more public housing units whatsoever should be constructed in that portion of the city.

The Director stated that the map on page 65 of the report shows the distribution of public housing units which are existing or which are in the planning stage; and he emphasized that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not recommended that more public housing should be built in areas of the city which already have more than their share of public housing units. In fact, the staff had recommended that the ratio of public housing units and low-income housing units to the total housing units in any planning area should be about the same as the ratio is for the total city.

7/9/70

Mr. Peterson felt that if Federally subsidized low-cost private housing were to be constructed adjacent to public housing projects, the participants in the original developments would eventually leave, thus turning those units into public housing, also. In conclusion, he stated that he hoped that a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning would be able to attend one of the meetings of his organization to discuss the report.

Peter Witmer, representing the Alamo Square Association, stated that while the Directors of his organization had not had an opportunity to review the report thoroughly, he had read the report in considerable detail. He regarded the report as being well done and comprehensive; but he questioned the extent to which the policy stated on page 41 of the report to the effect that no area of the city should have a higher percentage of public housing than other areas would be implemented. He felt that the objective was a good one; and he wished that it could be achieved. However, he noted that the chart on page 18 of the report shows that the Western Addition Planning Area already has a greater proportion of public housing units than most other areas of the city; and the chart on page 64 of the report indicates that 741 additional units of public housing had been planned for the area. In addition, the Western Addition Planning Area has between 2,200 and 2,500 units of low- to moderate-cost housing. Within a five-block radius of Alamo Square, there are a total of 1,426 units of public housing; yet, at the same time, the chart on page 64 of the report showed that Planning Area 15, the Outer Sunset District, has only six units of public housing at the present time with only 79 more units of public housing in the planning stage. Under the circumstances, he felt that only a token effort had been made to place public housing units in the western portion of the city; and he suggested that it is time for the City to undertake serious reconsideration of its previous policies.

Mrs. Victor Fleming, representing the Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association, noted that the map on page 37 of the report showed that the existing Master Plan of the City and County has designated two areas on Potrero Hill for high-density development; and she stated that residents of Potrero Hill had sent a letter to the City Planning Commission several years ago requesting that those areas be reclassified from high to medium density zoning.

Mrs. Garabedion, representing the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, stated that the members of her organization had not had an opportunity to meet as a group to discuss the report. She, personally, felt that the recommendations contained in the report were encouraging; and she indicated that she was particularly pleased with the recommendations for maintenance of the existing housing stock and for scattered site public housing. In conclusion, she stated her hope that a representative of the staff of the Department of City Planning would be able to attend the August 13 meeting of her organization.

7/9/70

Joseph Levinson, a member of the Potrero Hill Boosters and Merchants Association, endorsed the remarks which had been made earlier by Mr. Peterson. In addition, he wanted to observe that the Old Goat Farm site could be subdivided into important view lots for further development. He stated that he had lived on Potrero Hill for three years and had never seen any representatives of the Department of City Planning who were present tonight except for Mr. Jacobs who had met with residents of the neighborhood regarding the Wisconsin Housing site. He advised the Commission that seven black groups on Potrero Hill had formed a coalition; and, as a result, the taxpayers in the area have no voice in the affairs of the neighborhood. He did not understand why the property owners in the area should be put on the defensive and forced to fight for something which is ordinarily considered as part of being an American. He stated that Potrero Hill does not need any more units of public housing that it now has. He stated that his house had been burglarized three times; and, as a result, he was very dissatisfied with the way that the City is being run. Since the Potrero Hill area is run-down already, there is no advantage to be gained by adding more public housing units to the area; and he did not understand why the City will not let good things happen in his neighborhood.

The Director asked Mr. Levinson how he felt that the Old Goat Farm site should be developed. Mr. Levinson replied he felt that the site should be divided into private lots.

The Director stated that the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning for construction of 40 to 50 family private market-rate housing units on the site was not in conflict with the type of development desired by Mr. Levinson; in fact, both were talking of the same objective.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that many of the members of the Commission were familiar with Potrero Hill, a neighborhood which has some of the best views and one of the best climates in the city. He stated that he was puzzled about what has been happening on the Hill; however, he assured Mr. Levinson that he would take into consideration the comments which people would make during the course of the series of public hearings to be scheduled on the Improvement Plan for Residence.

William Blackwell, an architect, commented on the general excellence and completeness of the staff report and expressed appreciation for being given an opportunity to express his opinions before action is taken by the Commission on the proposals contained in the report. He questioned the fundamental assumption of the report which seemed to him to be that San Francisco should not get very much bigger in terms of numbers of people or families; and he indicated that he could see no way to resolve the many difficulties confronting the city unless it does get very much bigger.

7/9/70

While higher residential densities do require more schools, libraries, policemen, health facilities, etc., he felt that it is also a fact that a higher residential density, especially if it can be accomplished at the middle-income level, means that there are more people to pay for the additional services and facilities. He stated that it is generally true that the cost of providing city services per family decreases as residential density increases. Furthermore, he felt that high density living has many advantages which might be of great importance to the health and vitality of the city. Five advantages which he wished to mention were as follows:

1. Convenience. Proximity to a wide variety of cultural, educational, recreational and social activities as well as to schools, shopping, recreation, and public transportation.
2. Improved Services. A large spectrum of stores and services catering to a wide range of minority tastes.
3. Increased property taxes to the city.
4. Increased retail income and activity, affecting every single function in the city.
5. Political influence. Today San Francisco has only four Assemblymen and may lose two of those when the 1970 Census data is released; and, if the present policy of supporting the status quo is continued in San Francisco, the City may eventually have no votes.

While commenting on the five advantages of high density which he had cited, Mr. Blackwell suggested that rather than a five-year moratorium on taxes for those who rehabilitates their houses, as suggested in the report, a better policy might be an adjustment in taxing policy in a uniform way so that an owner who makes improvements benefits while an owner who allows his property to deteriorate is penalized. He also stated that in order to solve its housing problems, the city needs not just several thousand new houses but a massive input of new housing, most of which must be in the middle-income range. He suggested a goal of at least a 25% increase in population for San Francisco over the next 10-year period; and, in conclusion, he argued that the general objectives of the staff report ought to be far greater and far more dynamic in terms of residential growth and development.

Gene Morzenti, President of the Telegraph Hill Survival Association, stated his organization had not taken an official position regarding the staff report; however, in his own opinion, the effect of the report would be to discourage people from doing things which might be considered desirable because of the additional regulations which were being proposed. He

7/9/70

stated that San Francisco has two-thirds of the public housing presently existing in the Bay Area; and he felt that San Francisco should not assume any greater share of the burden. Instead, he felt that the City should create an environment in which private investors are encouraged to spend money to create new housing for everyone. The recommendations which were contained in the report, however, seemed to be designed to encourage the opposite results.

Mrs. James Cronin, representing the League of Women Voters, stated that her organization had received only two copies of the staff report which were being passed around from member to member; therefore, they were not prepared to comment on the report at the present time. She indicated, however, that she would be prepared to comment at one of the subsequent hearings to be held by the Commission.

Reuel Brady, representing the Bret Harte Improvement Club, complimented the staff on the quality of the report on the Improvement Plan for Residence. He felt, however, that everyone should realize that the proposals in the report will deal with people and not with buildings; and he felt that an effort should be made to accommodate poor and middle-income people in San Francisco so that they will not have to be sent to live outside the city. He remarked that 1200 units of public housing had been approved in 1968; and he wondered why they have not yet been built. Furthermore, he regretted the fact that the issue of public housing for the aged in the Yerba Buena Center had become a matter of litigation in the courts. He believed that difficulties had arisen because people have not paid attention to the society in which they live; and he felt that everyone should realize that the rich, the middle-class, and the poor must live together in the city. However, in order to make the situation bearable, homes are needed for human beings; and, since all the homes which are needed could not be provided in one area of the city, he felt that every effort should be made to achieve the objectives stated in the report for distribution of public housing throughout the city.

Mary Hall, chairman of the San Francisco Fairness League, stated that she had not received a copy of the report and asked if two copies could be sent to her. She indicated that she had read in the newspaper that the report contained a proposal to utilize air space over existing buildings for construction of housing; and she remarked that such an approach should have been taken before the Redevelopment Agency was allowed to remove from the tax roles property which had previously brought \$65,000,000 to the City.

Alan Maremont stated that he supported the staff's emphasis on maintenance of the existing housing stock, but he questioned whether the tools listed in the report to achieve that objective would be adequate. He noted that the report had not recommended any means for systematic replacement of structures in neighborhoods which are 75 or 80 years old; and he felt that

7/9/70

some of those neighborhoods might, in fact, require renewal. In order to avoid renewal projects, he believed that means must be found to renew the housing supply before the neighborhoods have deteriorated; and he felt that a solution to the problem would be to have a Federally-financed program for the annual purchase of a certain number of structures throughout the city for replacement, with particular emphasis being placed on single-family structures.

Mr. Wolff, who had requested additional time to address the Commission at the conclusion of the hearing, stated that he loves San Francisco but that he does not appreciate the fact that organizations such as the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency can come into a neighborhood, label it a slum or a skid row, and proceed with its destruction. He stated that the area in the vicinity of 4th and Mission Streets is not a skid row; yet, until residents of the area had filed suit against the Redevelopment Agency, no one paid any attention to them. Since that time, it seemed that everyone was publishing reports on the subject of housing. He remarked that the Civic Center already has a sports arena and a parking garage; and he did not understand why the Redevelopment Agency proposed to duplicate those facilities in the South of Market area at the cost of existing housing. He believed that people should not be pushed around to make way for garages and sports arenas; and he felt that it was the responsibility of the Commission to replace the housing units which are being torn down in the Yerba Buena Center.

Donald Ramacciotti, representing the East Mission Improvement Association, stated that he would like to receive a copy of the report so that he would be able to comment on its contents at a later date.

Sherri Thorp, representing the New Arrival Center, asked who had received copies of the report and notices of the Commission's hearing. The Director replied that approximately 1300 copies had been distributed; and he stated that everyone who had received a copy of the report had received notice of the Commission's hearing.

Miss Thorp questioned whether it would be possible for the Commission to obtain a consensus from the community regarding the proposals made in the report unless a copy of the report is made available to everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 16, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 16, 1970, at 1:45 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Walter S. Newman, Vice President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Edward Michael, Planner III; John Sanger, Planner II; Alan Lubliner, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:45 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of May 21 and June 4 and 11, 1970, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

The Director reported that he had appeared before the Regional Transportation Planning Committee on Wednesday evening to present a statement on design criteria for freeway construction in the Golden Gate - Northern Waterfront Corridor. The report, which was modified somewhat from the draft which had been submitted to the Commission on June 18, was generally well-received; but, the Committee did express interest in having the Commission act to approve the recommendations in principle. President Kearney stated that a public hearing should be scheduled before action is taken by the Commission.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

7/16/70

The Director advised the Commission that construction in the vicinity of the 16th and 24th Streets BART stations on Mission Street is scheduled to begin within the next month based on work done by this Department under the direction of Mr. Murphy with Urban Design consultant assistance.

The Director stated that he had been asked to participate with the regional offices of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the National Park Service in preparing general plans and proposals for development of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. In response to this request, and because of the nearly full-time effort required at present, he had assigned Bruce Anderson to serve as this Department's representative on the project.

R70.49 Lot 6, Block 5286A, 2245 Jerrold Avenue
Jurisdictional transfer from Department of Public Works
to Fire Department.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Lot 6, Block 5286A, is located in the Islais Creek industrial area and is zoned M-2. The lot, of irregular shape, has a 115-foot frontage on Jerrold Avenue, is approximately 520 feet deep, and has an area of 60,600 square feet. Although it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works, it has been used by the Fire Department since 1937. There is a building on the lot which serves as headquarters for the Fire Department's Bureau of Engineering and Water Supply, and the rear of the lot is used for pipe storage.

"The Fire Department wishes to relocate Engine Company No. 37 and Truck Company No. 9 in a new firehouse on the front of Lot 6 from the station at 25th and Vermont Streets which was cut off from its service area by the James Lick Freeway. Funds for the new station have been allocated from the 1964 Fire Department bond issue. The Fire Department would like to have jurisdiction over the site before construction takes place. The Firehouse Location Plan of the Public Facilities Section of the Master Plan shows the abandonment of the station at 25th and Vermont Streets and the location of a new station in the general area of the Jerrold Avenue site."

The Director recommended that the proposed transfer of property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the City Planning Commission would have any control over the design of the new firehouse. The Director replied in the negative but indicated that the Art Commission does have a considerable degree of control over the design of public buildings. He

7/16/70

also noted that the Fire Commission had conducted a competition to select architects to prepare plans for new firehouses; and he expected that a contract would be given to one of the winners of the competition to design the firehouse now being proposed.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Mrs. Andrew Gallagher, representing the Southern Promotion Association, stated that she and the various industries in the area were happy about the location which had been chosen for the new firehouse.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the jurisdictional transfer of Lot 6, Block 5286A of the Department of Public Works to the Fire Department is in conformity with the Master Plan.

PRESENTATION OF GOLDEN GATE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR STUDY

Bill Liskamn and John Torrey of Okomoto/Liskamn, Giff Randall, Chris Anderson and James Ellis of Kaiser Engineers, and Robert Shields and Tito Sasaki of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, reported on alternative rapid transit and bus systems being studied as possible links between downtown San Francisco and Marin County. Three possible rail systems were described, one of which would involve an extension of the BART system from Richmond to Marin County and two of which would involve construction of new rapid transit systems from San Francisco to Marin County. One of the routes recommended for rapid transit connection between San Francisco and Marin County would run in subway from Post and Kearney Streets along Geary Boulevard to 16th Avenue, underground through the Presidio, and across the Bay on a new second deck of the Golden Gate Bridge; the second alternative route would run underground from Post and Geary Streets northward via Columbus Avenue and then under the Bay to Sausalito. Special bus routes, running underground in San Francisco, were also being considered. It was indicated that formal recommendations would be made to the State Legislature in the spring of 1971.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if it would be impossible to construct a rapid transit tube underwater at the Golden Gate instead of conducting a second deck on the Golden Gate Bridge. Mr. Randall replied that the depth of the water at the Golden Gate is 350 feet. Therefore, while it would not necessarily be impossible to construct an underwater tube at that point, such a project would be extremely expensive.

7/16/70

Commissioner Ritchie then asked if construction of a second deck on the Golden Gate Bridge would flatten and change the silhouette of the bridge. Mr. Randall replied that the weight of a second deck would cause the arc of the bridge to drop approximately four feet. He noted, however, that a greater drop had occurred when new structural supports were constructed under the bridge in 1954.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that one of the alternatives which had been described would involve construction of a tunnel for busses through the Marina District, asked if the tunnel would conflict with a freeway tunnel which might be constructed by the State Division of Highways through the same area. Mr. Liskamm replied that the two projects would be co-ordinated.

Commissioner Mellon asked if estimates had been made of the different travel times which would be required to reach downtown San Francisco from San Rafael by way of a rapid transit route running directly to San Francisco as compared with an extension of the BART route from Richmond. Mr. Ellis replied that the travel time from San Rafael to downtown San Francisco would be approximately 38½ minutes by way of Richmond; travel time on the route running southward from San Rafael through Marin County to San Francisco would be approximately 19.2 minutes on the Columbus Avenue tube alignment and 29.3 minutes on the Geary subway alignment.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning was of the opinion that the rapid transit route along the Geary Boulevard Corridor would serve the greatest number of people and provide the most revenue; furthermore, if such a rapid transit route is not provided by the Golden Gate Bridge District, it will inevitably have to be constructed under the direction of the City. On the other hand, construction of a rapid transit route running northward from downtown San Francisco with a stop at Broadway would ultimately result in the expansion of downtown San Francisco to the north rather than to the area south of Market Street, thus posing a major problem with regard to the character of Telegraph Hill. Such a rapid transit route would also develop pressures for new construction in the vicinity of Ghirardelli Square and the Cannery of a type which would not be desirable. The rapid transit alternative running from San Rafael to Richmond and thence to San Francisco would obviously not bring residents of northern Marin County to San Francisco as quickly as the other rapid transit alternatives; and it would more than likely give importance to Oakland as the center of the Bay region rather than San Francisco. If a bus tunnel were to be constructed along the northern waterfront, the possibility of co-ordinating such a tunnel with a freeway tunnel being considered for the same area might not be possible if the freeway is built first; and, since construction of a second deck on the Golden Gate Bridge would open the possibility of adding two new automobile lanes to the bridge as well, such a proposal might cause serious problems for San Francisco which has taken the position that the vehicular capacity of the Golden Gate Bridge should not

The first of these is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The second is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The third is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

The fourth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The fifth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The sixth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

The seventh is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The eighth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The ninth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The tenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

The eleventh is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The twelfth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The thirteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The fourteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The fifteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The sixteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The seventeenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The eighteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The nineteenth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood. The twentieth is the fact that the system is not a simple one. It is a complex one, and it is one that is not easily understood.

7/16/70

be increased. Under the circumstances, he felt that the rapid transit route along Geary Boulevard would be the most desirable alternative of those described from the point of view of the City and County of San Francisco.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, remarking there had been disagreement in the past as to whether it would be possible to run rapid transit trains across the Golden Gate Bridge, asked if that issue had finally been resolved. Mr. Randall replied that it was assumed that new technology would be able to provide the type of rapid transit cars which could be run on the bridge by the time that the Golden Gate Bridge District's long-range plans are implemented in the 1980's.

At 2:55 p.m. President Kearney announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

CU70.72 Request for authorization for a development not directly related to the conduct of water-borne commerce or navigation, of a height exceeding 84 feet but less than 125 feet in Northern Waterfront Special Use District #1, and to provide a lesser number of parking spaces than required by the City Planning Code for the intended uses. Oceanic Office Building and Hotel development of Piers 1 to 7.

President Kearney noted that there was a court reporter present in the audience and stated that the Commission had no objection to having the proceedings recorded providing that a transcript of the recording would be made available for the files of the Department of City Planning. Dick Wilkinson, Project Director for the Ferry Port Plaza Company, the applicant, agreed that he would provide a copy of the transcript for the Commission.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property, which is owned by the Port Commission, is basically rectangular in shape, runs 1,620 feet along the Embarcadero at the front of the existing piers, and extends 1,252 feet into the Bay to the pierhead line. The site consists of approximately 42 acres. The applicants had filed plans with the Department of City Planning which were intended as a master plan for the area between the Ferry Building and Broadway; and, as such, the plans did not give final dimensions but rather the parameters within which final development would proceed. Mr. Steele described the project being proposed as follows:

7/16/70

"To construct a multi-use project in two major buildings having heights up to 125 feet. Uses to include:

Offices		1,140,000 sq. ft.
Hotel	1,200 rooms	
Restaurants		75,000 sq. ft.
Convention facilities	2,000 seats	
Commercial Retail		
Retail		140,000 sq. ft.
Restaurants		70,000 sq. ft.
Services		55,000 sq. ft.
Theater	1,000 seats	
Parking	2,000 to 2,400 cars	

"With the exception of the major parking facility, the structures housing the aforementioned uses are to be constructed on a pier located between Jackson Street and Broadway, extending approximately 1200 feet into the Bay and having a width of 570 feet. A four level parking structure would extend along the entire project frontage; it would be located in the Bay, below Embarcadero level and extend outward from the waterfront line about 130 feet.

"The hotel would be located at the outer-most extremity of the pier. Constructed around an inner court, it would have seven floors of guest rooms over ancillary and support uses (including one level of parking of about 400 spaces).

"The other proposed uses would be contained in two structures flanking a central galleria extending for about 600 feet along the east-west axis of the pier. Parallel to this axis, beginning at the 4th floor (elevation 47 feet) receding staggered setbacks would be employed up to the maximum possible height of 125 feet.

"Public open space is indicated above the garage, between the hotel and office building and along the north and south edges of the platform.

"The applicant has submitted two documents relative to parking requirements and traffic generation resulting from the proposal. The first, 'Parking Demand Analysis' by Larry Smith and Company indicates that while the City Planning Code would require 4,185 spaces for proposed uses, the multi-use nature of the project, with varying peaks for weekdays versus evening and weekend, could probably be accommodated with 1900 spaces. However, upon

7/16/70

recommendation of the consultant approximately 2,400 spaces are to be provided to accommodate the unusual peaks. Submitted also in this connection is a 'Traffic and Parking Study' by Deleuw, Cather & Company. This report is concerned primarily with access to and egress from the development insofar as it relates to The Embarcadero and connecting streets in the vicinity."

Mr. Steele then reviewed the various provisions of the City Planning Code which would govern construction on the subject site, noting that while the height of structures in the area is limited to 65 feet and 84 feet, the City Planning Code does provide that the City Planning Commission, via the conditional use procedure, may authorize height exceptions in the 84-foot section provided:

1. the height of the building or structure so approved does not exceed 125 feet; and
2. within this 125-foot maximum, there shall be a limitation on permitted building bulk above the basic height limit of 84 feet, calculated as the product of 41 feet and 50% of the project area.

He indicated that the applicant had not proposed any construction in the 65-foot height limit area of the subject site. However, in authorizing exceptions up to 125 feet above the 84-foot height limit governing the remainder of the site, the Commission would be required to consider the siting of the building or structures so that higher elements are located nearest the Embarcadero and lower elements outward from the Embarcadero toward the Bay, with a gradual stepping down in height.

Mr. Steele stated that since the subject property is located in Northern Waterfront Special Use District No. 1, the following criteria would also have to be considered in authorizing the requested conditional use:

- "1) Provision to the extent feasible along the sea wall and along the perimeter of piers or platforms, of public access and of open spaces available for public use and suitable for viewing purposes or water-oriented recreation;
- "2) Limitation of water coverage in the Northern Waterfront area from the Hyde Street Pier to Pier 46 so as not to exceed the degree of coverage by piers as existing at the effective date of this Section;
- "3) Construction of new piers or platforms so that the water's edge shall be maintained at the sea wall where feasible;

7/16/70

- "4) Provision or maintenance of view corridors along streets into the Bay, and of panoramic views, in accordance with the Master Plan; and
- "5) Development over the water generally on piers or platforms rather than on fill."

Concluding his remarks, Mr. Steele stated that the subject application should also be considered with reference to the following criteria which had been extracted from the goals, objectives and policies of the Northern Waterfront Master Plan amendment;

- "1) The scale of the environment must be observed and structures which appear massive must be avoided.
- "2) Development along The Embarcadero should reflect development inland to the greatest extent possible in order to generate continuity of feeling on the land and bay sides of The Embarcadero.
- "3) In no case should any development be permitted which will hamper the undergrounding of The Embarcadero freeway where it is presently above grade.
- "4) Pedestrian promenades must be provided as a portion of the total pedestrian promenade extending from the overlook at the Bay Bridge northward to Aquatic Park.
- "5) No development proposed should detract from the Ferry Building and particularly its tower, as the symbolic entrance to the City from the Bay."

William Curlett, representing the Ferry Port Plaza Company, stated that representatives of the various firms involved in the partnership were present in the audience. He indicated that their objectives had been to propose a viable project which would be of high quality and which would be compatible with the Master Plan of the City and County of San Francisco. An excellent team of people had been formed to work on the project; and a great deal of time had been spent to bring plans for the project to their present state. He stated that an effort had been made to keep all of the responsible City agencies informed during the course of the preliminary study; however, flamboyant public publicity had been avoided.

1) The first of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in agriculture. This group is the largest and it is the one which is the most important for the country. It is the one which is the most numerous and it is the one which is the most important for the country.

2) The second of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in industry. This group is the second largest and it is the one which is the second most important for the country. It is the one which is the second most numerous and it is the one which is the second most important for the country.

3) The third of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in commerce. This group is the third largest and it is the one which is the third most important for the country. It is the one which is the third most numerous and it is the one which is the third most important for the country.

4) The fourth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in services. This group is the fourth largest and it is the one which is the fourth most important for the country. It is the one which is the fourth most numerous and it is the one which is the fourth most important for the country.

5) The fifth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in agriculture. This group is the fifth largest and it is the one which is the fifth most important for the country. It is the one which is the fifth most numerous and it is the one which is the fifth most important for the country.

6) The sixth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in industry. This group is the sixth largest and it is the one which is the sixth most important for the country. It is the one which is the sixth most numerous and it is the one which is the sixth most important for the country.

7) The seventh of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in commerce. This group is the seventh largest and it is the one which is the seventh most important for the country. It is the one which is the seventh most numerous and it is the one which is the seventh most important for the country.

8) The eighth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in services. This group is the eighth largest and it is the one which is the eighth most important for the country. It is the one which is the eighth most numerous and it is the one which is the eighth most important for the country.

9) The ninth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in agriculture. This group is the ninth largest and it is the one which is the ninth most important for the country. It is the one which is the ninth most numerous and it is the one which is the ninth most important for the country.

10) The tenth of the two main groups of the population is the one which is engaged in industry. This group is the tenth largest and it is the one which is the tenth most important for the country. It is the one which is the tenth most numerous and it is the one which is the tenth most important for the country.

7/16/70

Dick Wilkinson, Project Manager for the Ferry Port Plaza Company, stated that work on the proposed project had been underway for well over a year; and he confirmed that liaison had been maintained with agencies such as the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the Port Commission, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, and the Department of City Planning. An agreement had been reached with the Port Commission for lease of the subject property; and a bond had been posted assuring performance by his firm. He stated that plans for the project had developed through a process of evolution; and he indicated that the final design was the product of many restraints, including those established by the Northern Waterfront Plan, the existing height limits, and the need for preserving view corridors along city streets, extensions of five of which cross the subject site. In addition, extensive economic studies had been made of the proposed project as well as studies of tidal activity in the vicinity of the subject property. The site itself consists of approximately 42 acres of water; and, after construction of the proposed project, approximately 55% of the side would remain as open water. In addition to the open water, 25% of the developed portion of the site would serve as public open space since a total of six acres of walkways, parks, and plazas would be constructed on the site. The proposed building would not be a skyscraper; and, rather than regretting that fact, the developers felt that their project would be superior to a skyscraper since its scale would relate better to people. Furthermore, the subject site is located at the "front door" of San Francisco for people arriving from the water; and he felt that the proposed project would be a fitting landmark for the site.

In addition, the proposed project would bring various other benefits to the city. The \$100,000,000 construction cost for the project would stimulate the economy; and, after completion, the hotel alone would provide 1500 jobs, many of which could be filled from minority groups. In addition to the lease payments which would be made to the Port, the City would receive revenues from property taxes, the hotel tax, and retail tax in the amount of approximately \$6,000,000 a year. However, he felt that the prime benefit of the project to the City would be in the fact that the project would provide access for the public to San Francisco Bay in every sense of the word.

Chuck Basset, representing the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, used slides, posters, and an architectural model to describe the architectural details of the proposed project. He stated that the "galleria" which would run through the office building and terminate in an interior court of the hotel would have a width of 50 feet and a height of 110 feet; it would have a glass roof and would be lined with retail commercial activities. He also emphasized that it would be possible for pedestrians to walk completely around the perimeter of the platform which would be constructed over the water.

7/16/70

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the length and width of the platform and the height of the proposed buildings. Mr. Basset replied that the platform would have dimensions of 675' by 1175'; and he indicated that the proposed office building would have a height of 125 feet with mechanical penthouses rising 16 feet beyond that point.

Commissioner Ritchie then inquired about the amount of floor space which would be available in the proposed building. Mr. Basset replied that the project would include approximately 1200 hotel rooms, 1,140,000 square feet of leasable office space, and 275,000 square feet of commercial space.

Commissioner Ritchie then inquired about the cost of the proposed platform and the cost of the proposed garage. Mr. Curlett replied that the platform would cost approximately \$15 per square foot. While he did not have an estimate of the cost of the proposed garage, he indicated that the entire project would cost approximately \$110,000,000.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the project would be constructed in stages and, if so, what portion of the project would be built first. Mr. Curlett stated that the phasing of the project would inevitably depend on economic circumstances. While the project could not be broken down into more than two phases, he felt that it was possible that the first effort would be to construct the hotel and, concurrently, one-half of the proposed office space.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that Mr. Wilkinson had indicated that the proposed project would bring approximately \$6,000,000 in revenue to the City each year from rent and taxes, asked if the applicants could provide a more specific breakdown of the estimated revenues. Mr. Wilkinson replied that rent, consisting of a minimum-plus percentage, would bring between \$500,000 and \$1,500,000 to the City each year; property taxes, based on 3% of the development costs, would provide approximately \$3,000,000 in revenue each year. He indicated, however, that hotel taxes and sales taxes would be more difficult to estimate.

Commissioner Ritchie asked for a comparison between the size of the proposed platform and the area covered by the existing piers. Mr. Wilkinson replied that the existing piers cover an area of 513,000 square feet. Mr. Curlett stated that the proposed platform will have an area ranging from 750,000 to 800,000 square feet.

Commissioner Newman, noting that the City Planning Code requires that new construction in the northern waterfront area not exceed the water coverage of the existing piers, asked if the applicants proposed to provide additional open space in another area to compensate for the fact that the platform being proposed would cover a greater amount of water than the existing piers. Mr. Wilkinson replied that it was his understanding that there are a number of obsolete piers in the Northern Waterfront which might

7/16/70

be removed to provide the additional open space. In any case, since most of the new development being contemplated by the Port Commission would take place in the vicinity of the Ferry Building, it seemed sensible to him to allow more coverage of the water in that area and to seek the creation of new open space in other portions of the Northern Waterfront. He believed that the staff of the Department of City Planning had considered that problem and was prepared to recommend a means of dealing with it.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the proposed project might exceed the water coverage of the existing piers by as much as 287,000 square feet, remarked that it might be difficult to provide such a large amount of compensating open space in another portion of the Northern Waterfront area. Mr. Wilkinson replied that he had understood from the Department of City Planning and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission that any portions of the proposed project devoted to park use could be deducted from the overall coverage figure.

Edward Lawson, representing the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, stated that his organization wished to endorse the proposed project. From a city planning standpoint, the members of the agency were enthused about the design of the project; and, in terms of taxation, the project would provide needed revenues for the City. Additional office space is needed in the city; and the jobs which would be provided both during construction of the project and upon its completion would aid the economy of the city.

President Kearney stated that he had received a card from John W. Russell, 25 Libra Terrace, stating that he wished to be shown on the record as being in favor of the proposal.

Sam Husbands, a member of the Port Commission, stated the objectives of his Commission involve construction of the proposed project north of the Ferry Building, construction of another project south of the Ferry Building, and creation of a platform plaza between the two developments. If those goals could be achieved, the remainder of the Northern Waterfront could be preserved for lower-intensity uses. He stated that Piers one through seven, which would have to be removed for the proposed project, as well as other piers located north of the Ferry Building, can be used to handle palletized cargo; however, they are not suitable for container-type operations. After the removal of Piers 1 through 7, other piers in the Northern Waterfront could continue to be used for maritime operations with the exception of Pier 41 which may have to be replaced. While he could not speak officially for the other members of the Port Commission, he indicated that it was his own opinion that the removal of Pier 41 could be used to offset the additional water coverage which would be required by the platform being proposed by the present applicants.

7/16/70

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the Port Commission would agree to the removal of Pier 41 if such a requirement were made by the City Planning Commission upon approving the subject application. Mr. Husbands replied that he could speak only for himself and not for the other members of the Port Commission. However, he doubted that the existing pilings of Pier 41 would have a life span of more than 10 years. Miriam Wolff, Director of the Port Commission, estimated that the pilings of Pier 41 will not last more than five years; and, as a result, that pier would be removed before the project presently under consideration is completed.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mr. Husbands if he personally would agree to the tearing down of Pier 41 if the subject application should be approved. Mr. Husbands replied that it was his intention that such a course of action should be followed.

Commissioner Mellon asked if it would be the intention of the Port Commission to replace the excess water coverage of the proposed project with a comparable amount of newly-created open water in another area of the Northern Waterfront even if a decision were made that Pier 41 should not be involved in the exchange. Mr. Husbands responded affirmatively, noting that his statement was not being made officially.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the Port Commission had not taken an official position regarding the exchange of property. Mr. Husbands replied that the matter had never been formally discussed by his Commission. Miss Wolff explained that she had only recently been informed of the actual square footage of the proposed platform; and she indicated that her Commission had not had a formal meeting since she had received that information.

Commissioner Mellon then asked Mr. Husbands if he felt that his Commission would agree to abide by the provisions of the ordinance which had been adopted governing development in the Northern Waterfront area. Mr. Husbands replied in the affirmative. He remarked, however, that it was conceivable that it would be more desirable to retain Pier 41 for recreational purposes, thus giving people a better exposure to the water, than to require its removal.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared conditions which could be considered by the Commission if it wished to approve the subject application; and he indicated that one of the conditions would require that the water coverage issue be resolved before any building permits for any portions of the proposed project are authorized.

7/16/70

Mr. Husbands, concluding his remarks, stated that he felt that the proposed project would be an exciting and a spectacular addition to San Francisco; and he indicated that the members of the Port Commission were pleased both with the design and the financial potential of the proposed project.

Mrs. Hans Klussmann, representing San Francisco Beautiful, felt that visitors taking hotel rooms in the proposed hotel building would be more than gratified; however, while the project would have many attractive features, she did not feel that she could give it her whole-hearted support. Furthermore, since there seemed to be many unanswered questions regarding the project, she could not see how it would be possible for the Commission to take favorable action on the application during the course of the present hearing. She understood that the Bay Conservation and Development Commission was then in session to consider the proposed project; and, since that agency would play an important role in determining whether the project could proceed, she did not feel that the City Planning Commission should act on the application without knowing how the Bay Conservation and Development Commission will react to the proposal. Mrs. Klussmann personally felt that the scale of the proposed project would be too massive; and she indicated that it would have approximately the same dimensions as two Cow Palaces placed end to end. While the project would provide public access to the water, it would at the same time result in a massive building being extended far into the Bay. The sketches which had been displayed by the applicants did not portray the true massiveness of the proposed project; and, under the circumstances, she felt that the Commission should subject those sketches to a critical analysis. Mrs. Klussmann stated that she had recently been in the Bank of America Building and had looked down over San Francisco; and, after seeing the many areas of the city which need renovation and which could profit from the construction of new buildings, she felt that it was regrettable that the proposal presently being considered by the Commission would result in the construction of the wrong building in the wrong place. However, if the project were to be constructed, she felt that it should be smaller, that it should have less height, and that it should not extend so far into the water; and, while she did not claim to be a fiscal expert, she questioned whether the project being proposed would actually help the San Francisco taxpayers.

Robert Katz, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stated that the first report for the Northern Waterfront area which had been prepared by John S. Bolles and Associates had called for a 65-foot height limit on the subject property; however, after being subjected to certain pressures, the firm had published a final report recommending that the subject property be subject to 65 and 84 foot height limits. Subsequently, when the Master Plan for the area had been adopted by the City Planning Commission, the subject property had been included in two height-limit districts. In one district,

7/16/70

the maximum height would be 65 feet; however, in the other district, a basic 84-foot height limit could be expanded to 125 over 15% of the total area of property devoted to a single project. Since those figures had been somewhat abstract, it had not been possible to visualize what their effect would be until the applicants had described their project earlier in the meeting. He felt that the proposed project had many desirable and delightful details; however, he objected to the height and the bulk of the project as related to the topography of the city. He remarked that the length of the proposed office building would be approximately 1200 feet; and he pointed out that the Opera House, the Veteran's Building, the City Hall, and Civic Center Plaza would have to be added together to approximate that length; or, as Mrs. Klussmann had noted, the length of the office building would equal that of two Cow Palaces. He understood that the width of the proposed office building would be approximately 570 feet; and, thus, it would be wider than the City Hall and almost as wide as the Cow Palace. The height of the office building would be 140 feet, or twice the height of the City Hall or the Pentagon. The entire project would cover 45% of the 42 acre site or roughly 18 or 19 acres; and, as such, the size of the project would be equal to 18 or 19 foot ball fields or more than one-half the size of the Pentagon. Parenthetically, he noted that the proposed project should be the subject of further study both in fairness to the City and in fairness to the developers.

Mr. Katz indicated that he had many questions regarding the "swap" of uncovered water area mentioned by Mr. Husbands to meet the requirement of the City Planning Code that any new project should not exceed the present degree of coverage of the water by piers; and he wondered if the Port Commission would provide compensating open space at Pier 41 or in other areas of the northern waterfront free of charge. Furthermore, he pointed out that the actual language of the City Planning Code provides that "in considering any application" the Commission should consider various criteria, including the criterion that any development in the Northern Waterfront should not exceed the present degree of water coverage by piers; and he interpreted the language of the Code to mean that each application must be considered individually. Under the circumstances, the proposal for a "swap" in the present instance seemed to him to be of questionable legality. While remarks had been made that the proposed project would open up the waterfront to the public, he pointed out that the same fact would be true of any project which would involve the demolition of the existing piers.

Mr. Katz stated that he had never been fond of the Embarcadero Freeway; however, that structure does have one small redeeming feature in that it provides a beautiful view of the Bay for motorists. Yet, if the proposed project were to be constructed, it would rise 90 feet above the Freeway and it would ruin the view from that structure. Furthermore, considering the bulk and mass of the proposed project, he felt that a dangerous precedent

7/16/70

would be established if the Commission were to act hastily in approving the application. He noted that Commissioner Fleishhacker had previously requested economic information from the Port to substantiate the need for the U.S. Steel development; however, when the Board of Supervisors had asked if the information had been provided to Commissioner Fleishhacker, the Port Commission had replied that they had not had an opportunity to answer him. He felt that the answer should be provided now since it would be impossible to plan properly without knowing the overall financial needs of the Port. Under the circumstances, he wished to join Mrs. Klussmann in requesting that further consideration be given to the proposal before action is taken by the Commission. In conclusion, he stated that while the Zoning Ordinance allows the City Planning Commission to approve applications such as the one under consideration if certain conditions are met, the Ordinance does not mandate the Commission to approve such applications.

Frederic Selinger, representing Taxation With Representation, noting that the applicants had referred to the amount of revenue which the proposed project would bring to the City; and he wondered if the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared figures to indicate how much the project would cost the City in terms of additional Municipal Railway facilities, streets, sewage facilities, police protection, etc. He asked the question because he believed that the Commission's decision on the subject application would have to be based on questions of economics as well as standards of architectural design.

The Director stated that the proposed project, to his knowledge, would not require the construction of any new streets. He stated that the staff had not obtained figures regarding the added cost which the project would bring to the Municipal Railway or the Police Department; and he indicated that such figures are not usually obtained by the staff in its review of applications similar to the one under consideration. With regard to sewers, he stated that it was his feeling that the purpose of taxes is to provide such facilities.

Mr. Selinger stated that it was his position that the cost to the taxpayers which would be occasioned by the 110 million dollar project should be considered by the Commission, especially since the developers had already made a point of citing the financial benefits which would accrue. With regard to the design of the project, he noted that the "galleria" would have a length equal to three football fields; and he did not know if such a long esplanade would be attractive. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should consider whether the design of the building could be made more attractive if slight changes were to be made. In conclusion, he stated that he agreed with Mrs. Klussmann that the Commission should not act on the application until more facts and figures are available, including the decision of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission regarding the proposal.

7/16/70

The Director stated that he had been informed that the Bay Conservation and Development Commission was meeting to consider the BART platform behind the Ferry Building and not the development being considered by the City Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Selinger about the nature of the organization which he represented. Mr. Selinger replied that his organization has approximately 30 members.

Gerald Cauthen, representing San Francisco Tomorrow, remarked that the project being considered was the first one of its type to be presented in any form since adoption of the Master Plan for the Northern Waterfront; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it would be timely to ask certain general questions regarding the character of the development being proposed. He noted that various projects under construction or in the planning stage such as the U.S. Steel development, the Golden Gateway, the Embarcadero Center and the Ferry Port Plaza, will bring a total of 8,000 new parking stalls in the waterfront area between Howard Street and Broadway. This would mean an increase of between 30 and 50 percent in the number of parking stalls available in the area; and he felt that the number of parking stalls being proposed would be excessive. While some people would contend that a project as large as the one being proposed would not be feasible without automobile access and without a large garage, his own feeling was that people would not leave their automobiles in the garage all day but would take them out to go to lunch or for other purposes; and, as a result, the impact of the facility on the city streets could not be ignored. He stated that the whole country is beginning to realize that reliance on the automobile as a primary means of transportation is coming to an end; and, in fact, all of the legislators of the Bay Area had recently supported a bill to use gas tax funds for transit. He remarked that available parking stalls, similarly to the availability of freeways, induce more people to drive more miles in their automobiles; and, for that reason, he felt that the parking requirements for the proposed project should be the subject of a critical re-evaluation and that greater emphasis should be placed on access to the project by transit. He also felt that the developers should consider reducing the massiveness of the project; and, in that light, if some of the parking spaces were to be removed, other aspects of the project should not be enlarged to occupy the vacated space.

Commissioner Mellon asked Mr. Cauthen if he would recommend elimination of all parking spaces in the proposed project. Mr. Cauthen replied in the negative but indicated that a 20 to 30 percent reduction in the amount of parking spaces proposed for the project would seem to him desirable if, at the same time, something positive were done to increase the attractiveness of using transit facilities to gain access to the development.

7/16/70

George Choppelas, attorney for six local taxpayers who preferred to remain anonymous, stated that his clients were concerned about the legality of certain activities of the Port Commission in terms of the Charter and other laws. He had spent the past six months gathering background information on the subject; and, as a result, he felt that it was obvious that a project of the magnitude and uniqueness of the one under consideration would have to fall in line with the provisions of the McAteer Petris Act governing uses of the Bay. One item of the McAteer Petris Act in particular seemed pertinent to him in that it provides that buildings constructed on the Bay must be water-oriented; and he felt that it was questionable whether a hotel and office building complex would meet that criterion. Under the circumstances, he urged the Commission to obtain an opinion from the City Attorney commenting upon some of the issues which might arise in the future if projects of the sort presently under consideration were to be approved.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he assumed that non-maritime uses proposed for the waterfront would be referred to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission for approval. Mr. Choppelas agreed; however, he did not feel that any evidence had been given that the proposed development would in fact be a water-oriented project. If the office building were used for law offices, it would not be a water-oriented use unless, perhaps, only maritime law were to be practiced; the hotel, however, might qualify as a water-oriented use if it were designed as a "boatel" with access from the water as well as from the mainland. His own feeling was that the intent of the McAteer-Petris Act was to provide that non-maritime uses which can be located satisfactorily away from the waterfront should be built elsewhere and that the waterfront property should be used exclusively for water-oriented developments.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had not understood the references to the McAteer-Petris Act and wondered whether the point which Mr. Choppelas was trying to make was that the Commission would be threatened with litigation if the subject application were to be approved. Mr. Choppelas replied that any action taken by any public body can be made the subject of a "taxpayer's suit". Ordinarily, actions taken by the City Planning Commission are relevant only to the City Planning Code and the Charter; however, in the present instance, laws of other government agencies could apply, also. Under the circumstances, and particularly since the subject application was the first of its type to be considered by the Commission, he felt that the Commission should seek the advice of the City Attorney and guide itself on that advice.

7/16/70

Having been asked by Commissioner Newman to comment on the remarks made by Mr. Choppelas, Miss Wolff stated that she had understood the point which he was trying to make. She stated that the McAteer-Petris Act had resulted in the establishment of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission; and, since the original Act had been amended a number of times, it would not be a simple matter to determine how the authority of all the agencies involved might be affected. She did not feel that the Commission could make a legal determination of the myriad possibilities of the law; and, therefore, she felt that the Commission should proceed to act on the application as it might see fit, knowing that the action, like all others taken by the Commission, might be subject to a taxpayer's suit.

Dolly Koler, 637 Alvarado Street, remarked that the proposed project would have many attractive features, such as the galleria, public access to the water, and parks and open space. However, because of the great bulk of the project, and because the buildings would exceed the 84-foot height limit on the site, she felt that approval of the project would set a very dangerous precedent for the future.

President Kearney and the Director assured Mrs. Koler that the proposed project would be completely compatible with existing ordinances which allow height exceptions up to a maximum of 125 feet on portions of the site subject to conditional use approval by the Commission.

Mrs. Koler stated that she was of the opinion that the proposed buildings would be too high and that a maximum height limit of 84 feet would be more reasonable along the waterfront. No matter how much the city may enjoy having tourists, the city itself is basically for the people who live here; and, since projects of the sort being proposed would last forever and would be mostly for the benefit of tourists, she felt that it was important that the scale of the project should be appropriate to the scale of the city.

Mrs. Kenneth Evers, 255 Chestnut Street, stated that she assumed that the current hearing would be unnecessary unless the applicants were in fact requesting exceptions from established standards. Considering the amount of time which had been spent by the community in developing standards for the Northern Waterfront for the protection of everyone, she felt that it was unfortunate that the Commission should now take the position that the standards and policies which had been established are not rigid. Under the circumstances, she could only conclude that the policies and restrictions regarding height, density, parking space, etc. had been meant to apply only to poor people and not to outside developers coming in from the East Coast; and, even if the project being proposed were to be constructed of solid gold and studded with diamonds, she would object to it on the basis of the principle that "outsiders" should not be treated differently from other people in terms of the law. She remarked that she had

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm, humid air of the city. I shivered slightly, pulling my coat closer. The streets were empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I walked towards the building, my steps echoing on the wet pavement. The air smelled of rain and old stone. I reached the entrance, the heavy door creaking as I pushed it open. Inside, the room was dimly lit, the light from a single lamp casting long shadows. I looked around, my eyes adjusting to the darkness. The room was large and empty, with a high ceiling and ornate moldings. I walked towards the back, my footsteps silent on the polished floor. The door at the end of the hallway was slightly ajar. I pushed it open, the light from the room beyond shining through the gap. I stepped inside, the door closing behind me. The room was small and cozy, with a fireplace and a comfortable-looking chair. I sat down, feeling a sense of peace and solitude. The fire crackled in the hearth, casting a warm glow. I looked at the clock on the wall, the hands pointing to a late hour. I sighed, leaning back in the chair. The world outside was still, the only sound being the soft rustle of the fire. I closed my eyes, feeling the warmth of the room and the comfort of the chair. The night was quiet, the stars shining brightly in the dark sky. I felt a sense of calm, a sense of being at home. The world was still, and I was alone.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm, humid air of the city. I shivered slightly, pulling my coat closer. The streets were empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I walked towards the building, my steps echoing on the wet pavement. The air smelled of rain and old stone. I reached the entrance, the heavy door creaking as I pushed it open. Inside, the room was dimly lit, the light from a single lamp casting long shadows. I looked around, my eyes adjusting to the darkness. The room was large and empty, with a high ceiling and ornate moldings. I walked towards the back, my footsteps silent on the polished floor. The door at the end of the hallway was slightly ajar. I pushed it open, the light from the room beyond shining through the gap. I stepped inside, the door closing behind me. The room was small and cozy, with a fireplace and a comfortable-looking chair. I sat down, feeling a sense of peace and solitude. The fire crackled in the hearth, casting a warm glow. I looked at the clock on the wall, the hands pointing to a late hour. I sighed, leaning back in the chair. The world outside was still, the only sound being the soft rustle of the fire. I closed my eyes, feeling the warmth of the room and the comfort of the chair. The night was quiet, the stars shining brightly in the dark sky. I felt a sense of calm, a sense of being at home. The world was still, and I was alone.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm, humid air of the city. I shivered slightly, pulling my coat closer. The streets were empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I walked towards the building, my steps echoing on the wet pavement. The air smelled of rain and old stone. I reached the entrance, the heavy door creaking as I pushed it open. Inside, the room was dimly lit, the light from a single lamp casting long shadows. I looked around, my eyes adjusting to the darkness. The room was large and empty, with a high ceiling and ornate moldings. I walked towards the back, my footsteps silent on the polished floor. The door at the end of the hallway was slightly ajar. I pushed it open, the light from the room beyond shining through the gap. I stepped inside, the door closing behind me. The room was small and cozy, with a fireplace and a comfortable-looking chair. I sat down, feeling a sense of peace and solitude. The fire crackled in the hearth, casting a warm glow. I looked at the clock on the wall, the hands pointing to a late hour. I sighed, leaning back in the chair. The world outside was still, the only sound being the soft rustle of the fire. I closed my eyes, feeling the warmth of the room and the comfort of the chair. The night was quiet, the stars shining brightly in the dark sky. I felt a sense of calm, a sense of being at home. The world was still, and I was alone.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm, humid air of the city. I shivered slightly, pulling my coat closer. The streets were empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I walked towards the building, my steps echoing on the wet pavement. The air smelled of rain and old stone. I reached the entrance, the heavy door creaking as I pushed it open. Inside, the room was dimly lit, the light from a single lamp casting long shadows. I looked around, my eyes adjusting to the darkness. The room was large and empty, with a high ceiling and ornate moldings. I walked towards the back, my footsteps silent on the polished floor. The door at the end of the hallway was slightly ajar. I pushed it open, the light from the room beyond shining through the gap. I stepped inside, the door closing behind me. The room was small and cozy, with a fireplace and a comfortable-looking chair. I sat down, feeling a sense of peace and solitude. The fire crackled in the hearth, casting a warm glow. I looked at the clock on the wall, the hands pointing to a late hour. I sighed, leaning back in the chair. The world outside was still, the only sound being the soft rustle of the fire. I closed my eyes, feeling the warmth of the room and the comfort of the chair. The night was quiet, the stars shining brightly in the dark sky. I felt a sense of calm, a sense of being at home. The world was still, and I was alone.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm, humid air of the city. I shivered slightly, pulling my coat closer. The streets were empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I walked towards the building, my steps echoing on the wet pavement. The air smelled of rain and old stone. I reached the entrance, the heavy door creaking as I pushed it open. Inside, the room was dimly lit, the light from a single lamp casting long shadows. I looked around, my eyes adjusting to the darkness. The room was large and empty, with a high ceiling and ornate moldings. I walked towards the back, my footsteps silent on the polished floor. The door at the end of the hallway was slightly ajar. I pushed it open, the light from the room beyond shining through the gap. I stepped inside, the door closing behind me. The room was small and cozy, with a fireplace and a comfortable-looking chair. I sat down, feeling a sense of peace and solitude. The fire crackled in the hearth, casting a warm glow. I looked at the clock on the wall, the hands pointing to a late hour. I sighed, leaning back in the chair. The world outside was still, the only sound being the soft rustle of the fire. I closed my eyes, feeling the warmth of the room and the comfort of the chair. The night was quiet, the stars shining brightly in the dark sky. I felt a sense of calm, a sense of being at home. The world was still, and I was alone.

7/16/70

known of people who had sought permission to construct an additional dwelling unit on their property but had been refused because they could not meet the one-for-one parking requirement of the City Planning Code; yet, in the present instance, the applicants wished to have their parking requirement reduced, to exceed the established height limit, and to be permitted other exceptions from the rules. It had been her impression that all properties along the Embarcadero were governed by an 85-foot height limit; and she had thought that the height limit would pertain to the construction of buildings on the land and not over the water. Even if the height of the proposed project here kept at 85 feet, it would have a massive appearance because it extends so far out into the water. Also, the Northern Waterfront Plan had proposed that the height of buildings should begin at 85 feet at the base of the hills and then taper to lower heights nearer the water; and she pointed out that the proposed project would not meet that criterion. Furthermore, while a requirement had been established that extra coverage of the water in any one area should be balanced by the uncovering of an equivalent amount of water in another area, she feared that the proposed swap of Pier 41 was being used only as a bargaining weapon and that the trade of open space would not in fact be mandatory.

Barry Bunshoft, an attorney for the Save San Francisco Bay Association, stated that he was concerned about various legal factors involved in both the subject application and the proposal of the U.S. Steel Corporation for construction of a project south of the Ferry Building; and he felt that a legal decision should be obtained regarding the extent to which the Port Commission has authority to proceed with such projects without violating the McAteer-Petris Act and the Constitution of the State of California, which provides that the tide-lands have been conveyed to the Port Commission as a public trust for limited uses such as commerce, navigation, and fishing, but that they actually belong to all of the people. He stated that he had intervened against the West Bay development in San Mateo County, that he had opposed the proposed sale of some of the Leslie Salt properties, and that he had brought suit against the City of Albany; and he felt that it was inevitable that a suit would be brought against the Commission by his organization, the Sierra Club, and other citizen's groups, if the Port Commission were allowed to proceed to develop its property against the public interest and in conflict with the law.

The Director, noting that several speakers had raised questions regarding the legality of the proposed project, stated that to the best of his knowledge the City Attorney had approved the action previously taken by the Commission in preparing plans for development of Port-owned properties with non-maritime uses; and he noted that the zoning for the subject property had been based on those plans. He emphasized that the City Planning Commission was considering the subject application in terms of its conformance with the City Planning Code; and, if other non-local legislation were pertinent, any decision of the City Attorney regarding such

7/16/70

legislation would be subject to question in the courts in any case. He proceeded to read an eight-page memorandum which he had prepared analyzing the extent to which the proposed project conformed or failed to conform to the requirements of the City Planning Code and the urban design terms of reference which had been established by Ordinance in Sections 120.5 and 240.1 of the City Planning Code and, additionally in the Master Plan Amendment for the Northern Waterfront area. He concluded that the requirements of Section 303(c) of the City Planning Code appeared to have been met by the plans for the proposed project. In addition, the urban design terms of reference had either been substantially met, determined to be non-applicable or in process requiring further documentation. He therefore recommended that the proposed Master Plan for development of the Ferry Port Plaza be found in conformance with the requirements for conditional use authorization and that the Master Plan for the project be approved with appropriate conditions.

While reading the memo, which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning, the Director remarked that the developers had worked closely with the staff of the Department of City Planning over a very long period of time; and the developers had made a number of changes in their plans at the request of the staff of the Department of City Planning. While several members of the public had requested that action on the application be deferred to provide additional time for study of the proposal, he noted that the plans had been on display in the Department of City Planning since June 19 and that very few people had bothered to come in to look at the plans or to discuss them with members of the staff. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that it would be fair to penalize the developers further by delaying action on the application.

Mr. Steele distributed copies of a draft resolution of approval which had been prepared and read the eight conditions which the resolution contained.

President Kearney asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Curlett replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the draft resolution be adopted and that the application be approved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he hoped that it was clear to everyone present that the proposed project would not be in violation of the law and that no special privileges were being requested by the applicants. He stated that the applicants had filed a conditional use request; and, in considering that request, it was the responsibility of the Commission to determine whether the proposed project would meet the various

7/16/70

guidelines which had been established. He, also, emphasized that the applicants had worked with the staff of the Department of City Planning for a number of months in preparing their proposal; and he indicated that most of the members of the Commission had been given an opportunity to become familiar with the plans prior to the present hearing. With regard to the questions which had been raised about legal procedures, he remarked that any taxpayer may file a suit with or without merit at any time; and, if such a suit were filed against the proposed project, the developers and the Port Commission would have to prepare a defense. He remarked that the project is big and that it does extend far out into the water; however, if the project were not of such a magnitude, it would not generate sufficient revenue to allow the Port to remain in operation. In any case, he felt that the architect for the proposed project should be complimented on the plans which he had prepared.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he is in the real estate business and that he has an appreciation for the time and energy which projects such as the one under consideration can consume; and he felt that the architect, within certain limits, had prepared a very interesting plan. However, as a member of the City Planning Commission, he was a little disappointed in the model which had been presented of the project because it did not accurately convey the bulk or size of the development. He felt that the project would be enormous; and, because of its prominent location on the waterfront, he felt that the model should have shown its relationship to the Bay Bridge, the U.S. Steel project, Telegraph, Russian and Nob Hills, and the man-made hill of the financial district. With such a small model to view, he doubted that it would be possible for anyone to really graph the magnitude of the project until the project has actually been completed. He also felt that it would be remiss of the Commission to approve the project, which would cover more of the water than the present piers without knowing beforehand the exact nature of the exchange which would be made to compensate for the increased water coverage; and, under the circumstances, he felt that action should be taken by the Port Commission before the subject application is approved. He also noted that questions have been raised regarding the projects conformity with the requirements of the McAtteer-Petris Act and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission; and he felt that the Commission should obtain answers to all of the outstanding questions before taking final action on the proposal.

President Kearney remarked that the Commission fulfills two responsibilities: to provide for the healthy, economic growth of the City and, at the same time, to try to protect the quality of living in San Francisco. At the present time, the economic responsibility is particularly important because of the City's social problem which can be solved substantially only by money which is not now in existence ... money which will allow people to hold jobs at a meaningful salary level. It is also necessary to improve the quality of education in San Francisco to prevent people

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was a warm, humid breeze that seemed to embrace me. The air was thick with the scent of tropical flowers and the distant call of birds. I took a deep breath, feeling a sense of peace and wonder. The landscape was a mix of lush greenery and sandy paths, leading me to a small, rustic building with a thatched roof. I approached it with a sense of curiosity, wondering what secrets it might hold. The door was open, and a soft light emanated from within, drawing me in. I stepped inside, and the world seemed to change. The air was cooler here, and the sounds of the outside world faded away. I found myself in a room that felt like a sanctuary, a place where time stood still. I sat on a low wooden bench, looking out at the view through a large window. The sun was setting, painting the sky in shades of orange and pink. The water in the distance shimmered under the fading light. I felt a profound sense of connection to this place, as if I had found a hidden gem in a world of many wonders. The experience was unforgettable, a moment that would stay with me for the rest of my life.

The second thing I noticed was the way the light played on the water, creating a shimmering effect that danced across the surface. It was a beautiful sight, one that I had never seen before. The water was calm, reflecting the colors of the sky and the surrounding landscape. I stood up, feeling a sense of awe and wonder. The world around me seemed to be a masterpiece of nature's artistry. I took a few steps forward, feeling the sand beneath my feet. The texture was soft and warm, a perfect contrast to the cool air. I looked down at my feet, marveling at the way the sand had been shaped by the wind and water. It was a simple yet profound experience, one that reminded me of the beauty of the natural world. I felt a sense of peace and tranquility, a feeling that I had never experienced before. The world seemed to be a vast, open space, a place where I could be alone and at the same time feel a sense of connection to everything around me. It was a magical moment, one that I would cherish for the rest of my life. The experience was a reminder of the beauty of the world and the power of nature to inspire and heal. I felt a sense of gratitude for the moment, for the way it had changed my perspective on the world. It was a gift, one that I would never forget. The world was a beautiful place, and I was grateful to be a part of it. The experience was a reminder of the beauty of the natural world and the power of nature to inspire and heal. I felt a sense of gratitude for the moment, for the way it had changed my perspective on the world. It was a gift, one that I would never forget.

The third thing I noticed was the way the wind carried the scent of the flowers, filling the air with a sweet, fragrant aroma. It was a beautiful smell, one that I had never smelled before. The flowers were in full bloom, their petals a vibrant red color. I took a deep breath, feeling the scent fill my lungs. It was a wonderful feeling, one that made me feel like I was in a garden of paradise. I looked up at the sky, where the sun was setting, painting the clouds in shades of orange and pink. The water in the distance shimmered under the fading light. I felt a profound sense of connection to this place, as if I had found a hidden gem in a world of many wonders. The experience was unforgettable, a moment that would stay with me for the rest of my life.

7/16/70

from moving to the suburbs; and money is needed for that purpose, also. There is a great demand for housing, but the City does not have the money necessary to provide it. Local property owners have indicated that they are not willing to pay higher taxes; thus, the only way that the City can obtain money for necessary projects and programs is through economic growth; and the role of the Commission is to strike a balance between economic growth and aesthetics. That role, of necessity, involves compromise.

When the Embarcadero Center Project was approved by the City Planning Commission, it had many defects as well as many positive advantages; and, in that respect, it was similar to the project under consideration. Yet, while the proposed project might not afford everything that the Commission desire, the developers had worked closely with the staff of the Department of City Planning instead of creating pressures in the community for approval of the project; and the developers had done everything possible short of making the project financially unfeasible to meet the recommendations which had been made by the staff. Because of that fact, and because we are presently in the midst of a social revolution which is compounded by a period of recession in which neither jobs nor money are available, the best thing the Commission could do would be to approve the subject application.

Commissioner Mellon stated that he had not realized that any other members of the Commission would oppose the proposed project. However, in reaching a decision on the proposal, he felt that each member of the Commission would have to weigh the project in the light of the benefits which it would provide to San Francisco as opposed to the liabilities, if any, of the proposal. He stated that he could not help but feel that the proposed project would present a tremendous improvement over what now exists in the subject area along the waterfront. He stated that he is a native San Franciscan with a great deal of feeling for the City; yet, even when the Golden Gate Bridge was proposed, a tremendous amount of opposition had been raised about it and its design. Today, the public has no access to the water because of shipping activities; yet, such access would be provided by the proposed project. While the developers had been referred to as "outsiders", it was obvious that they were willing to make an investment in San Francisco; and he would be the last person to say that they should not be entitled to a return on their investment. In addition to providing aesthetic and economic benefits for San Francisco, the proposed project, when completed, would provide a great many opportunities for semi-skilled and unskilled workers to obtain jobs at good wages, particularly in the proposed 1200-room hotel. Until final plans are prepared for the project, no one will really be able to tell how the project will look or how massive it will be. Yet, enough information had been provided to fire his imagination about the proposal; and,

7/16/70

as a result of comments which had been made by proponents of the applications and by members of the staff of the Department of City Planning, he felt that the proposed project would be an aesthetic addition to the city.

Commissioner Newman stated that he did not particularly care about the investment involved in the proposed project; if that were all that were involved, he would prefer to have the entire Northern Waterfront remain open. However, he did not believe that the proposed project would spoil the Northern Waterfront area and he felt that the developers had done a terrific job in preparing plans for the project. He felt that it was unfortunate that the project is so big that it would extend so far into the water; however, he had sufficient faith in the developers and the architects to be convinced that the project would be an asset to the City.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he could not vote in favor of the application until answers were available to the various questions which had been raised concerning the proposal.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 5-1 to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6570 and to approve the application subject to the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Kearney, Mellon, and Newman voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, July 23, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 23, 1970, at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street; the field trip originally scheduled for 1:00 p.m. was cancelled.

PRESENT: James S. Kearney, President; Walter S. Newman, Vice President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Thomas J. Mellon and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV - Zoning; Calvin Malone, Planner III; Walter Stoll, Planner III - Transportation; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, summarized the present status of plans for the one-year study for the housing and recreation development in Chinatown as follows:

"In May of this year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development approved this Department's application for a \$50,000 grant to conduct a one year study for housing and recreation development in the Chinatown area. This grant will be matched by a one-third local share of \$25,000. Of this amount \$15,000 has been appropriated by the Board of Supervisors. To complete the required local share, the Department of City Planning has requested an additional grant of \$10,000 from the San Francisco Foundation. This request was endorsed by resolution of the Board of Supervisors two weeks ago. Action by the Foundation on this request is expected by early September.

Although the project will not get formally underway before October 1st, the staff of the Department is now involved in various activities involving organization of the project.

(a) Notices and a short questionnaire have been widely distributed in the Chinatown area to explain the project and to compile an updated list of persons within the community who are interested or want to be involved in the project.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20540
FROM THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20540
SUBJECT: [Illegible]

1. [Illegible]
2. [Illegible]
3. [Illegible]
4. [Illegible]
5. [Illegible]

6. [Illegible]
7. [Illegible]
8. [Illegible]
9. [Illegible]
10. [Illegible]

11. [Illegible]
12. [Illegible]

13. [Illegible]
14. [Illegible]

15. [Illegible]
16. [Illegible]

17. [Illegible]
18. [Illegible]

19. [Illegible]
20. [Illegible]

21. [Illegible]
22. [Illegible]

23. [Illegible]
24. [Illegible]

25. [Illegible]
26. [Illegible]

27. [Illegible]
28. [Illegible]

29. [Illegible]
30. [Illegible]

7-23-70

(b) A letter has been sent to 30 consultant firms to elicit their interest and qualifications for the project. The list of consultants included several firms based in the Chinatown area.

(c) The staff is preparing a list of candidates, representative of a wide variety of interests in the community, who would be willing to serve as a Citizens Advisory Committee for the project.

(d) The Housing Authority, Redevelopment Agency, Human Rights Commission, Mayors Office and the Recreation and Park Department have been asked to serve on an additional Advisory Committee to provide technical assistance for the project.

It is anticipated that by the last week in August all the preliminary work will be completed so that the Citizens Advisory Committee can be appointed by the Planning Commission and selection of the Consultant can be made.

I would like to briefly review the process by which the Consultant will be selected.

(a) "All" potential consultants have been notified, as I mentioned, and requested to respond to this Department by July 31st as to their interest and qualifications for the project.

(b) The Department and the Technical Advisory Committee will review the consultants' responses.

(c) The three most qualified firms will be asked to submit a formal proposal indicating:

- What work they would do
- How they would conduct the study
- What their time schedule would be
- Who would coordinate the work
- How they would work with Citizens Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee.

(d) The three firms will be asked to make a presentation to the City Planning Department, the Technical Committee and the Citizens Committee.

(e) The Department and the Technical Advisory Committee will agree on one consultant."

The Director, noting that one of the local newspapers had carried a series of articles which reflected badly on the integrity of the Department of City Planning with regard to administration of the Urban Beautification Program, stated that he had discussed the matter with the Controller and with the City Attorney's Office and had been assured that the Department had acted properly and had done nothing wrong or illegal. At the request of the Commission, the Director then read the bulk of a point-by-point rebuttal of the accusations and implications which had been made in the newspaper articles. The statement is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director's report be accepted by the Commission.

PRESENTATION BY BART STAFF OF ADVERTISING SIGNS TO BE INSTALLED ON THE MEZZANINE AND BART PLATFORM LEVELS IN SAN FRANCISCO RAPID TRANSIT STATIONS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that BART had made presentations elsewhere in the Bay Area to explain its policies for advertising signs engendering considerable interest, and the staff of the Department of City Planning had invited BART to make its presentation to the San Francisco City Planning Commission so that the policies could be publicly aired in this City. He stated that BART has already established policies for the amount, locations and character of advertising in each of its stations; and a contract has been awarded by them for installation and maintenance of the advertising. In San Francisco, nearly all of the advertising would be underground. In conclusion, he emphasized that none of the Bay Area communities has control of BART's advertising through its local ordinances since BART is exempted from such control by the California Government Code; therefore, the presentation which would be made would merely be for the information of the Commission and not in relation to any local legislation.

G. L. McDonald, Director of Public Relations for BART, summarized the steps which had been taken since 1965 to prepare for advertising in BART stations; a process which had culminated in a contract which had been signed in April, 1970, for the installation and maintenance of advertising in BART facilities. He indicated that the basic policy of the BART Board of Directors regarding advertising had consisted of three prime elements: 1. advertising should be a positive design element; 2. the location of advertising should be recommended by the architects for the various BART facilities; and 3. the Board of Directors of BART must approve the location of all advertising signs. Mr. McDonald stated that he had talked with one of the architects for the San Francisco stations earlier in the day and had been advised that the architect would be pleased to meet with the Commission at any time to discuss design and location of advertising in San Francisco stations; and he invited the members of the Commission to visit the BART office at 814 Mission Street to look at the models which had been prepared of the San Francisco stations and to see precisely where the advertising signs would be located. Parenthetically, he noted that all of the advertising signs to be installed in San Francisco by

7-23-70

BART would be located underground. He stated that BART would receive between \$250,000 and \$350,000 annual revenue from the advertising signs; and he indicated that transit systems all over the world had turned to advertising as an additional source of revenue.

Lawrence B. Ferolie, advertising officer of BART, presented a photographic slide show to illustrate how advertising signs would be accommodated in BART facilities and to compare the proposed installations with advertising in other rapid transit systems throughout the world.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked about the type of opposition which had been expressed to BART's advertising proposals. Mr. McDonald replied that several citizens had expressed the feeling that there should be no advertising whatsoever in the BART system; and he indicated that the Oakland City Planning Commission had expressed concern about certain advertising signs which might be visible from public thoroughfares. In reply to a further question raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker, Mr. McDonald stated that none of the advertising signs to be located in San Francisco would be visible from public thoroughfares. All of the signs would be located underground.

Commissioner Ritchie asked for a clarification of the Commission's jurisdiction over the advertising signs being proposed by BART. President Kearney replied that the San Francisco City Planning Commission had no jurisdiction whatsoever. The Director confirmed that fact but noted that other communities had taken policy positions in spite of the fact that they apparently had no legal control in the matter.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the Commission had taken policy positions and exercise moral persuasion over matters in which it has no jurisdiction, such as the use of Federal lands; and he felt that the Commission could act likewise in the present instance if it so desired.

Commissioner Ritchie asked how much of the total estimated advertising income would be derived from San Francisco. Mr. Ferolie replied that approximately one-third of the anticipated revenue would come from San Francisco.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that his personal feeling was that advertising would improve the appearance of the stations if it were well designed. Commissioner Finn stated that one of the problems with advertising at the airport is that the copy on the signs is not replaced often enough to maintain public interest.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if BART would maintain control over the copy of advertising signs to be located in BART facilities. Mr. Ferolie replied that BART would be able to refuse to allow a sign to be installed. Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked if political advertisements would be allowed, and Mr. Ferolie replied in the affirmative.

It is noted that the above mentioned information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The above information was received from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, and is being furnished to you for your information.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Commission should at least adopt a resolution requesting BART to exercise good taste in the design and selection of signs for the BART system. He also remarked that he had made a tour of various transit systems with other members of the community several years ago; and he wondered if those systems had displayed the type of advertising signs being proposed by BART. Mr. McDonald replied in the affirmative but indicated that the best examples of such advertising are to be found in Stockholm and Toronto and not in other systems in the United States. He remarked that the BART Board of Directors had adopted a policy precluding display of goods and materials since such items do not display well and are not replaced often enough; furthermore, the retailers in San Francisco had conducted a survey and had determined that they would not be interested in participating in the preparation and maintenance of such displays.

Henry Alexander, design consultant to BART, stated that merchandise displays had been refused by most of the merchants in both San Francisco and Oakland. The reason for the refusal, as expressed by one San Francisco store, was that it would be difficult to protect the merchandise from vandalism and theft; and, as a result, the stores would not provide their best or most attractive merchandise. He emphasized, however, that other types of advertising had been recommended for the BART stations with good reason, that reason being that if the advertising had not been designed into the stations, some future Board of Directors of BART would inevitably have decided that the revenue was needed and would have installed advertising without an overall design. He stated that advertising had been designed with the rapid transit system in Montreal but had been added to the Toronto system after its construction; and he indicated that there is a remarkable difference between the two systems.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had previously examined a mockup of one of the cars which will be used on the BART system and had been impressed by the fact that it had looked more like an airplane than a bus since it had contained no advertising; yet, the interior of the car which had been shown in one of Mr. Ferolie's slides had contained advertising signs. Mr. McDonald stated that each of the cars would contain between four and eight advertising signs; and he did not feel that they would detract from the overall attractiveness of the cars. He stated that certain areas in each car had been designed to accommodate advertising signs; and, by the same token, the design of the cars would prevent the placement of advertising signs in other areas such as above the windows.

Mr. Alexander stated that buses in San Francisco provide between 34 and 36 sites for advertising signs. The cars being designed for BART would accommodate a maximum of twelve advertising signs; and, since some of those spaces would have to be used for maps, a maximum of eight advertising signs for each car had been recommended. The number of advertising signs to be carried in BART cars might yet be reduced to four. Mr. Alexander also remarked that the revenue from limited and controlled advertising can be higher than the revenue from uncontrolled advertising; and, for that reason, advertising in the BART system will be minimized.

Commissioner Newman asked if the estimated revenue figure of between \$250,000 and \$250,000 would include revenue from the advertising to be placed in the cars, also. Mr. McDonald replied in the affirmative. Commissioner Newman then remarked that the estimated revenue figure seemed to him to be rather small.

The Director stated that the advertising proposed for the BART stations in San Francisco seemed to be reasonably well-designed and controlled; and he did not feel that it would be objectionable. However, since the cars for the BART system had been extremely well designed, he felt that they would look better without four, eight, or twelve panels of advertising.

James J. Bennis, representing Ecology Action Now, stated that he concurred with a BART Director from San Francisco who had stated that he is in the transportation business and not in the advertising business. He stated that Berkeley and Orinda had gone on record in opposition to BART's advertising proposals. Concord had opposed all of the advertising except that which would be located on kiosks. Richmond voted in favor of the proposals and then decided to reconsider its action. Contra Costa County will take the position that it should be allowed to control all advertising signs to be located in its stations. Concern had also been expressed in other communities, and among organizations such as the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth. He noted that BART's advertising standards provide no mechanism for prohibition of distasteful signs; and, as a result, the signs would have to arouse public protest before they would be removed. Furthermore, the contract which had been signed by BART would allow signs to be located along the full length of the walls in the platform areas at any time. Mr. Bennis remarked that a traveller's first impression of any city is gained as he steps out into a rapid transit station; and if the walls of the station were to be covered with advertising, he did not feel that a good impression would be created. Since City Planning Commissions in other communities had asked BART to reconsider its proposals, and since the Sierra Club and other organizations had opposed the advertising, he hoped that the San Francisco Planning Commission, also, would take a policy position regarding the proposal. Mr. Bennis advised the Commission that the designer and architect of the BART cars had fought to keep them free of advertising; and he indicated that he had written a letter to the Secretary of Transportation expressing concern about the possibility that advertising in the cars could result in a blighting of the system. Subsequently, he had received a response from the Assistant Secretary of Transportation stating that no formal standards exist for the regulation of such advertising; thus, the consultants chosen by BART would have to make the final decision on the matter. Mr. Bennis also advised the Commission that Parsons Brinkerhoff-Tudor-Bechtel had been opposed to having advertising in the BART cars; and they had undertaken a survey in which 76% of the people questioned had stated that they would prefer not to have advertising in BART cars. Sixteen percent of the people questioned had stated that they would not object to advertising if it would result in reduced fares. Of all of the people questioned who had opinions, 82% had stated that they did not wish to have advertising in the BART cars.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the City and County of San Francisco would share in any of the revenues of the BART system. The Director replied in the negative.

Mrs. Ralph Reynolds, representing the California Roadside Council, stated that her organization had not yet taken a position with regard to BART's advertising proposals since sufficient, accurate information had not been available to them. She felt that the citizens of San Francisco would want the advertising in the BART system to be a credit to the city and the system; yet, the presentation which had been made by BART had not convinced her that such standards would be met. She was not prepared to say that there should be no advertising in the BART system; however, if there is to be advertising, she felt that firm assurance should be given that the quality of the advertising would be higher than the current standards of the outdoor advertising industry.

Mrs. James Wiley, representing San Francisco Beautiful, stated that she had come to the presentation for the purpose of learning about BART's proposal; and she had been dismayed to learn that the citizens of San Francisco, who had "worked like dogs" to have the bond issue for BART approved, would not have any jurisdiction over the advertising to be placed in the system. She remarked that the estimated revenue from the advertising would be very small by today's standards; and, if new underground space were to be made available for advertising, she felt that a serious effort should be made to strike a bargain with the outdoor advertising industry whereby some of the billboards presently existing above-ground would be removed.

Commissioner Newman agreed that the amount of revenue to be derived from the advertising would be infinitesimal as compared with the cost of building the BART system; and, under the circumstances, he felt that it might be in San Francisco's best interest to recommend that no advertising be placed in its BART stations, particularly in view of the amount of money which is being spent for the beautification of Market Street. However, if the advertising were to be installed, he felt that it should be tasteful.

Commissioner Finn remarked that Mr. McDonald had stated that the advertising to be installed would be a positive design element; however, he felt that the slides which had been shown had not borne out that fact. Under the circumstances, he felt that stronger safeguards should be established to assure that the advertising would be of high quality and that the architects for the various stations would actually be able to determine where the advertising should or should not be placed. He also felt that it was slightly misleading to contend that San Francisco has no jurisdiction over the advertising proposals since San Francisco does name three members to the BART Board of Directors; and, under the circumstances, he suggested that the Commission could offer recommendations to those individuals.

The above information was furnished by the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., on January 10, 1968.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the estimated amount of revenue to be derived from the advertising is not an insignificant sum in itself but only in comparison to the total cost of the BART system. The cost would, in fact, be sufficient to lower the local tax rate by a few cents; and, in that regard, it would provide as much benefit as would similar economies in any City department. If the advertising signs are designed well, blending in with the design of the stations, the public will probably not have any great objection. On the other hand, if the signs are poorly designed and discourage people from riding on the system, they will inevitably be removed.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the staff of the Department of City Planning be requested to analyze the proposal and to recommend a policy position for consideration by the Commission.

MASTER PLAN CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR THE WESTERN ADDITION APPROVED REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA A-2

Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"Submitted for your review today are a number of amendments to the previously approved Redevelopment Plan for the Western Addition Project Area A-2. Because these amendments are considered major they require Commission review and recommendation under Section 118 of the Charter prior to review by the Board of Supervisors, which review is scheduled for July 27, 1970.

The proposed amendments fall into three categories, changes to the Land Use Plan concerning land use designations (districts), changes to the Land Use Plan concerning streets, and changes to the Standards for Development.

Changes in the land use designation of the plan are proposed for 38 parcels or areas of land. These changes primarily 1) increase potential residential density in the tier of blocks in the Project north of Geary Blvd., and in blocks along Franklin and Steiner Streets in a manner consistent with the existing R-4 and R-2 zoning of these areas, and in anticipation of the development of numerous privately sponsored apartments for the elderly; 2) increase the commercial areas of the Nihon Machi and Fillmore Center sub-project areas; 3) shift the relocation site for the John Swett Elementary School slightly to the northwest; 4) provide for the expansion of the San Francisco Opera House at Fulton and Franklin Streets; and 5) recognize on scattered sites desires of certain existing churches and other institutions in the Project Area to expand or relocate within the Project.

The proposed changes to the street pattern shown on the Land Use Plan involve 1) the abandonment of the previously proposed vacation of portions of Buchanan, Fern, O'Farrell, Olive, Ellis, Willow, Larch and Elm Streets, Golden Gate Avenue, and Redwood and Birch Streets, 2) the abandonment of the previously proposed widening of Turk and Fulton Streets, and 3) the proposal to close to vehicular traffic portions of existing O'Farrell, Bourbin, Buchanan, and Fulton Streets, and the previously proposed Turk to Golden Gate Street and Fulton to McAllister Street diagonal streets. The closing of Fulton Street between Gough and Franklin Streets, and the Fulton to McAllister Street diagonal Street, according to Redevelopment Agency Staff, is to occur only as a part of the use of adjacent property for the expansion of the Opera House; however, this stipulation is not included in the formal plan amendment submittal. The Redevelopment Plan does not state whether streets will be one-way or two-way in traffic flow, nor does the plan show where changes in sidewalk widths are contemplated to accommodate additional lanes of traffic within existing right-of-ways.

The changes to the Standards of Development applicable to the Land Use Designations of the Redevelopment Plan concern primarily additions or deletions to the permitted uses, and slight modifications to the density and usable open space standards. Additionally modifications are proposed in the parking requirement for the occupancies within the Project. Except for the standards for residential parking the Redevelopment Plan standards are the same as, or more restrictive than, City Planning Code standards for the most nearly comparable zoning districts.

A major departure from Planning Code standards is proposed for residential off-street parking where instead of the Planning Code Standard of one off-street parking space for each dwelling unit (one space for each two dwelling units designed for and occupied by elderly persons) the Redevelopment Plan proposal is one parking space for each dwelling unit except with the approval of the Agency, where low-to-moderate income housing development uses 15% or less of fronting block faces for curb cuts, three parking spaces for each four dwelling units (one space for each two dwelling units designed for and occupied by elderly persons except with the approval of the Agency, where low-to-moderate income housing development uses 15% or less of fronting block faces for curb cuts, one for each three dwelling units). As most of the new housing contemplated for the Project is low-to-moderate income housing to be developed on large parcels of land involving few curb cuts, this lower parking requirement would prevail throughout the Project. The Agency has submitted evidence to the Department of City Planning that the present car ownership and resident and visitor traffic generation of persons with low and moderate incomes in this area of the City is consistent with this lower off-street parking requirement. The Agency also states that the number of off-street and

on-street parking spaces will be greatly increased under the redevelopment program over that which existed previously.

The Zoning Administrator has granted parking variances allowing this proposed ratio of off-street parking for eight moderate income family housing projects involving large areas of land either constructed or in final design within the Project Area; however, in each case, the Zoning Administrator conditioned the variance on the ability to provide 100% off-street parking should need be shown for increased off-street parking in the future."

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Redevelopment Agency had held a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed plan changes; and, if so, he wondered if any neighborhood opposition had been expressed. Wilbur Hamilton, representing the Redevelopment Agency, stated that a public hearing had been held and that no opposition had been expressed to the plan changes now under consideration.

Commissioner Finn asked if the proposed street closings had been checked with all of the appropriate agencies. Mr. Passmore replied that the street closings had been reviewed by the transportation section of the Department of City Planning and by the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how the proposed closing of Ellis Street would affect east-west traffic. The Director replied that the present pattern of through traffic would not be affected since another portion of Ellis Street has already been closed. O'Farrell Street, likewise, is already closed to east-west traffic. The north-south streets which would be closed are either alleys or streets which do not carry through traffic at the present time. Under the circumstances, the proposed street closings had not raised any questions of concern to the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Newman inquired about the proposed closing of Buchanan Street. The Director replied that Buchanan Street is already closed in Redevelopment Project Area A-1; and he indicated that previously approved redevelopment plans for Project Area A-2 had indicated the street as being closed.

The Director read his recommendation on the proposed plan changes as follows:

"I recommend approval of the proposed redevelopment plan changes with the exception of the proposed amendment to the parking standards for residential development. It is felt that retention of the present minimum Planning Code standards for off-street parking is appropriate and that the Zoning Administrator should retain his ability to consider any changes from these standards under the variance procedure

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now living in urban areas. This is a result of the process of urbanization, which has been going on since the beginning of the 20th century. The population of the United States has increased from about 100 million in 1900 to over 200 million in 1950, and the majority of this increase has been in urban areas. This has led to a concentration of population in a few large cities, which has in turn led to a number of problems, such as overcrowding, pollution, and traffic congestion.

the monthly executive meeting in May and subsequently pointed off direct reports, complete teams and working committees, as well as having a responsibility within that he gave typical assignments to people within the team. He had a strong personal presence and ability to inspire and lead. He was a very strong and confident person, confident and able to make decisions and act on them. He was a very strong and confident person, confident and able to make decisions and act on them. He was a very strong and confident person, confident and able to make decisions and act on them.

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United Kingdom regarding the progress of its investigation into the alleged activities of the British Security Establishment in the United States.

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United States regarding the results of its investigation of the activities of the United States Information Agency in the field of human rights.

on an individual housing development basis. Additionally I would recommend that the closing of Fulton between Gough and Franklin Streets proposed by the Agency be only in conjunction with the expansion of the Civic Center onto the adjacent property, and lastly I would recommend that the Planning Commission note in the approval of the plan changes with the exception of the parking standards, that the Commission has not considered, nor is approving, any changes in traffic flow or changes in the number of traffic and parking lanes on existing street right-of-ways which would be retained in the Project Area.

Decisions on this very important issue which would affect the amenities of the Project Area must be more fully considered. However, it is staff's current position that no sidewalk narrowing other than that which has been already approved formally by the Commission should occur within the Project Area. I have prepared a Resolution for your convenience outlining these points and recommending referral of your action to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration next Monday."

Mr. Hamilton stated that the revised parking standards had been recommended by the Redevelopment Agency after a detailed analysis of parking demand in the area had been made. He stated that the agency's goal was to provide socially-oriented housing within Redevelopment Project Area A-2; and, based on previous experience with projects such as Martin Luther King Square and Bancker Homes, where 56% or less of the tenants own automobiles, it had been concluded that because of the nature of the income levels of the families living in the projects, because of the composition of the families, and because of other factors, that the one-for-one parking ratio would not be necessary.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the Zoning Administrator had been willing to grant variances in the past for housing projects in redevelopment project areas, questioned the desirability of changing procedures at the present time. The Director stated that he felt that it was important that the flexibility provided by the present procedure should be retained.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the position of the Redevelopment Agency was that the procedures should be changed since no need could be demonstrated for the one-for-one parking requirement.

Commissioner Finn stated that he would prefer to see the variance procedure used in each and every case rather than to remove the parking requirement altogether.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the revised plan called for the closing of Fulton Street between Gough and Franklin Streets and the creation of a new diagonal street from Fulton to McAllister Streets, remarked that the new diagonal street, in conjunction with the freeway ramps on the northern portion of the block, would result in an unnecessary cutting up of the block. He did

not feel that the new diagonal street would be necessary since westbound traffic could just as easily turn right on Franklin and then left on Fulton.

Commissioner Finn suggested that it would probably be desirable to close Fulton Street first. Then, after the new traffic pattern has become established, it would be possible to determine whether the diagonal should be constructed.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the proposed diagonal would not be constructed unless the need for it is demonstrated since it would require the acquisition of a rather large building at an expense of \$1,500,000. Mr. Hamilton also advised the Commission that legislation might be proposed in the future which would permit some increase of traffic volume on McAllister and Turk Streets by way of sidewalk narrowing; and he indicated that those proposals had been under discussion for a number of years.

The Director stated that such changes had not necessarily been agreed to by the Department of City Planning as noted in his recommendation. He indicated, however, that the matter could be discussed at a later date.

Commissioner Newman asked in what way the redevelopment plan would have to be modified if the City Planning Commission were not willing to approve the proposed exemption from the one-for-one parking ratio of the City Planning Code. Mr. Hamilton replied that the Redevelopment Agency would then have to continue to use the variance procedure to achieve a reduction in the number of parking spaces required; and, if such variances should be denied for any reason, it was likely that the number of dwelling units to be constructed would have to be reduced substantially.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6571 be adopted and the following statement be adopted as the report and recommendation of the Commission on the proposed plan changes:

"1. The proposed amendments considered in this Resolution are particularly set forth in proposed Plan Change No. 1 dated May 12, 1970 and marked "Exhibit A" and on five land use plan sheets submitted to the Commission by the Agency and marked "Exhibit B".

2. The City Planning Commission approves the amendments described in said "Exhibits A and B", except for the proposed off-street parking standards described under Table of Parking Requirements for Residential dwellings on the bottom of Page 4 and the top of Page 5 of said "Exhibit A", which residential off-street parking standards the Commission recommends be as a minimum the same as the off street parking requirements for dwellings under the City Planning Code.

3. The closing of Fulton Street between Gough and Franklin Streets indicated on Sheet 5 of said "Exhibit B" be approved only on the condition that said closing be in conjunction with the development of abutting property for expansion of the Civic Center.

4. The action of the Commission under this Resolution shall not be considered as a review of, or recommendation on, any future changes in traffic flow or number of traffic and parking lanes on any existing streets retained as open on Sheet 5 of said "Exhibit B".

5. The Director of Planning is hereby authorized to refer said proposed amendments, and this Commission recommendation, to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration."

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

1. The first of the two main parts of the report is a general survey of the situation in the country. It is a very interesting and informative survey, and it is well worth reading. It is a very good example of the kind of report that should be written by a member of the committee.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed account of the work of the committee. It is a very thorough and complete account, and it is well worth reading. It is a very good example of the kind of report that should be written by a member of the committee.

3. The third part of the report is a summary of the work of the committee. It is a very concise and clear summary, and it is well worth reading. It is a very good example of the kind of report that should be written by a member of the committee.

THE REPORT WAS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE

1000000

1000000

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY AND MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 30, 1970
2:15 P.M.

PRESENT: Commissioners Mellon, Newman, Porter, Ritchie.

The Commission adopted Resolution No. 6572 expressing its sorrow over the sudden death of its President, James S. Kearney, and cancelled and adjourned the meeting in respect to his memory.

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

ADJOURNED: 2:20 P.M.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 6, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 6, 1970, at 1:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James K. Carr, member of the City Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of June 18 and 25, 1970, be approved as submitted. The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning); Daniel Sullivan, Planner III - (Zoning); Patricia Peterson, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Maitland Zane represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

CURRENT MATTERS

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked the Secretary to read the sections of the Rules and Regulations of the City Planning Commission which relate to the election of a new President and Vice President in the event of the death of the incumbent President. The Secretary read Sections 1 and 2 of Article 3 of the Rules and Regulations, noting that the rules provide that the Vice President shall assume the responsibilities of the President in the event that the President is unable to act. The rules do not provide specific procedures to be followed for the election of a new Vice President under such circumstances.

Commissioner Porter stated that it had been the policy of the Commission not to elect officers until all positions on the Commission have been filled; and, since the Mayor had not yet appointed a new member to replace James S. Kearney, she felt that the elections should be deferred until that appointment has been made.

After discussion, the Commission decided to proceed with the confirmation of Walter S. Newman as President of the Commission but to defer the election of a new Vice President until Mr. Kearney's vacancy has been filled. It was then

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Report of the Board of Directors, January 1, 1917.

The Board of Directors, organized and continued in session on January 1, 1917, for the purpose of the following:

REPORT: William H. Hays, President; William H. Hays, Secretary; William H. Hays, Treasurer; William H. Hays, Auditor; William H. Hays, Counselor; William H. Hays, Chairman of the Board of Directors.

REPORT: James K. Smith, member of the City Council.

REPORT OF THE BOARD

The Board of Directors, organized and continued in session on January 1, 1917, for the purpose of the following:

REPORT: William H. Hays, President; William H. Hays, Secretary; William H. Hays, Treasurer; William H. Hays, Auditor; William H. Hays, Counselor; William H. Hays, Chairman of the Board of Directors.

REPORT: James K. Smith, member of the City Council.

REPORT OF THE BOARD

The Board of Directors, organized and continued in session on January 1, 1917, for the purpose of the following:

REPORT: William H. Hays, President; William H. Hays, Secretary; William H. Hays, Treasurer; William H. Hays, Auditor; William H. Hays, Counselor; William H. Hays, Chairman of the Board of Directors.

REPORT: James K. Smith, member of the City Council.

REPORT: William H. Hays, President; William H. Hays, Secretary; William H. Hays, Treasurer; William H. Hays, Auditor; William H. Hays, Counselor; William H. Hays, Chairman of the Board of Directors.

8/6/70

moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Walter S. Newman be confirmed as President of the City Planning Commission to fill the vacancy created by the death of James S. Kearney.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had met with George S. Livermore and Gustav Knecht, Jr., two members of this year's Grand Jury Committee, on Tuesday.

The Director informed the Commission that a public hearing for consideration of height limits proposed for the area south of the Ferry Building has been scheduled for the meeting of September 10.

The Director recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared to authorize Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, to attend the Annual Conference of the American Institute of Planners in Minneapolis, Minnesota, from October 17 through 21, 1970. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6573.

The Director then distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared at the request of the Commission recommending actions which should be taken by BART with regard to the advertising signs proposed to be installed in the new transit system. The resolves of the draft resolution read as follows:

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Planning Commission urges the following actions by the BART staff and directors;

"1. That careful restraint be exercised as to the amount of advertising permitted along train walls, so as to avoid an overwhelming and saturation of the platform level;

"2. That strong efforts be made toward high quality in the graphics of all signs, consistent with the design excellence of the rest of the BART system;

"3. That further consideration be given to plans to place advertising signs inside the BART cars, a move that would detract from the integrity and comfort of those cars; and

"4. That reconsideration be given, also, to the plan to include advertising messages in the program of train destination signs on the platforms, a move that would be confusing to transit riders and a detraction from the design objectives of these signs;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Secretary is hereby authorized to transmit copies of this resolution to the BART staff and directors for their consideration."

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to determine the nature of the problem. This involves a thorough understanding of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the nature of the problem is understood, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves a detailed analysis of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the causes of the problem are identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This involves determining the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and the resources that will be required to implement the plan. Once a plan of action has been developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that have been identified in the plan of action. Finally, the last step in the process of identifying a problem is to evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in solving the problem and whether any further action is required.

[illegible]

The study of biology is essential to understanding the world around us. It is the study of life and the organisms that inhabit it. Biology is a science that seeks to understand the processes of life, from the molecular level to the level of the entire organism. It is a field that is constantly evolving, as new discoveries are made and our understanding of life deepens. Biology is a fascinating and important field of study, and it is one that is essential to our understanding of the world.

Intent of this act of 1916, which is hereby amended, was to
 establish a national forest in the State of New Mexico, and to
 provide for the management of the same, and to provide for the
 management of the same, and to provide for the management of the same.

1. The above material is contained within the CONFIDENTIAL AREA of the document and should not be disseminated outside the confines of the document.

8/6/70

Commissioner Porter stated that it is sometimes boring to ride on the Municipal Railway; and, as a result, she had found the advertising signs carried in the Muni vehicles to be interesting and diverting. Thus, it seemed to her that use of advertising in the BART cars should not be discouraged.

The Director agreed that advertising is appropriate in the Muni vehicles; however, he felt that advertising panels would detract from the BART cars, which are exceptionally well-designed.

Lawrence Ferolie, Advertising Officer for BART, expressed concern about the staff recommendation that advertising signs not be placed inside the BART cars and that reconsideration should be given to the plan to include advertising messages in the program of train destination signs on the platforms. He stated that their consultant had advised that advertising signs would improve the appearance of the cars and that they would add to the enjoyment of riders, particularly in the tunnels; and, in any case, none of the cars would have more than eight advertising signs since the other available locations would have to be used for maps. He stated that the train destination signs would have cost approximately \$5,000,000; however, because of the agreement to use them for advertising, BART would be able to obtain the equipment at a cost of only \$1,000,000. Although the revenue from the advertising signs would be small in comparison to the cost of the entire transit system, the system will have few sources of revenue; and, since the system has been designed to be in service for 100 years, the revenue to be obtained from advertising will be substantial.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the advertising messages on the destination signs would bring more revenue than all of the other signs put together; and, for that reason, he would be reluctant to recommend against such advertising. His recommendation was that the draft resolution should be adopted only after deletion of the fourth recommendation relating to the advertising messages on the train destination signs.

Commissioner Mellon felt that the third recommendation, also, should be deleted from the draft resolution since most of the BART route in San Francisco is underground and since advertising signs in the BART cars might be of interest to the passengers. Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he would have no objection to one or two advertising signs in each car; however, he felt that four or eight signs in each car would be undesirable.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would prefer to adopt the draft resolution as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning without amendments.

Commissioner Fleishhacker emphasized that the \$1,000,000 annual revenue from all the advertising signs, if multiplied by the 100 years that the system will be in operation, would give a total revenue of \$100,000,000; and, since that revenue would be extremely important to BART, he did not feel that the Commission should recommend policies which would take away the sources of that revenue.

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to define the problem. This involves identifying the symptoms of the problem and determining the scope of the problem. Once the problem has been defined, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves identifying the factors that are contributing to the problem and determining the underlying causes. Once the causes have been identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This involves identifying the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and determining the resources that will be needed to implement the plan. Once a plan of action has been developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that have been identified in the plan and monitoring the progress of the implementation. Finally, the last step in the process is to evaluate the results of the implementation. This involves assessing the effectiveness of the plan and determining whether the problem has been solved.

...the fact that the ...

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

8/6/70

Commissioner Porter felt that advertising, if well-designed, can be attractive and interesting; and she felt that the most important action for BART to take would be to encourage its clients to obtain good designers.

Commissioner Newman stated that he had no objection to having advertising signs in BART cars providing that the signs are well-designed and limited in number; however, he did not feel that the fourth recommendation, concerning advertising messages on train destination signs, should be deleted from the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried 3-2 that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6574 with the following amendments:

1. Rewording of the third recommendation to read as follows:

"That further reconsideration be given to plans to place advertising signs inside the BART cars with a view to limiting the advertising signs to a minimum number."

2. Deletion of the fourth recommendation.

Commissioners Fleishhacker, Porter and Mellon voted "Aye"; Commissioners Newman and Ritchie voted "No".

The Director advised the Commission that he had been appointed to the Regional Planning Committee of ABAG.

The Director advised the Commission that the presentation of the Urban Design Principles Report, originally scheduled for last week, will be made at next week's meeting.

The Director then submitted a draft resolution which would declare the Commission's intention to hold a public hearing on September 3, 1970, to consider the reclassification of the area south of the P-zoned portion of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, north of Bancroft Avenue and east of Fitch Street, and the area west of the P-zoned portion of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard and east of Earl Street and the residentially-zoned districts west of the shipyard from M-2 to P. He stated that he had discussed the proposal with the Commander of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard and had been advised that the Navy would have no objection to the reclassification. Therefore, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6575.

The Director advised the Commission that he will be on vacation during the next three weeks.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that the Board of Education is scheduled to discuss the proposed El Polin School at its next meeting; and he indicated that he intended to read into the record of that meeting the position which had been

100-443887-1000

...the

taken by the City Planning Commission on the matter unless other members of the Commission had any objection. The other members of the Commission indicated that they had no objection to that proposal.

R70.55 Turnkey Housing for Elderly Persons, 227 Bay Street.

Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Sections 116.1 and 118 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Housing Authority proposing the purchase by the Housing Authority of a 51-unit apartment building nearing completion at 227 Bay Street for housing low-income elderly persons. The purchase would be accomplished under the turnkey housing program. The developer of the project is Gerson Bakar.

"The subject property, which is on the south side of Bay Street between Powell and Stockton Streets adjacent to the North Point Theater and facing the North Point Apartments, is zoned R-4, and has a frontage of 88.4 feet and a lot area of 12,162 square feet. The building contains 48 studio apartments and three one-bedroom apartments located on three floors over a ground floor lobby and garage which provides 34 off-street parking spaces for the property. The Housing Authority proposes to convert one of the one-bedroom apartments into a social room, leaving a total of 50 apartments for occupancy by elderly persons. A small amount of usable open space is provided in two interior courts, one of which would be adjacent to the proposed social room. Additional open space is provided the building in a small rear yard area. The ratio of less than one off-street parking space per dwelling unit provided this apartment building resulted from a variance granted by the Board of Permit Appeals in overruling an earlier denial by the Zoning Administrator when the developer had contemplated conventional marketing of the dwelling; however, in the case of elderly housing, the 34 spaces exceeds the minimum of 25 spaces required by the Planning Code for the occupancy proposed by the Housing Authority.

"The North Point Shopping Center in the block immediately northwest of the subject property provides convenience food, clothing, medicine and other incidental shopping. The site is provided public transit access to the downtown area by the No. 15 Coach Line which stops at the corner of Bay and Powell Streets, and is provided transit access to the Fisherman's Wharf and Aquatic Park areas by the No.s 15 and 19 Coach Lines. The North Beach Public Housing Project, containing approximately 220 apartment units for families, occupies two blocks fronting on Bay Street between Mason and Jones Street one block west of the subject site, and constitutes most of the present public housing now in the Northeastern Embarcadero area of the city. In the past few years,

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND. THE OTHER TWO WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS.

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND.

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND.

102

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS.

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS.

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO PLACES WHERE THE BODIES OF THE DEAD WERE FOUND. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS. THE BODIES WERE FOUND IN THE WOODS.

8/6/70

a large number of smaller market-rate dwelling units have been constructed in the North Point complex opposite the subject property and at the southeast and southwest corners of Bay and Stockton Streets east of the subject property. Older dwellings occupy the R-4 districts to the south of subject site. The Francisco Junior High School is south of the subject site."

The Director recommended that the proposal be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report to the Housing Authority and the Board of Supervisors that the purchase and use of the dwelling at 227 Bay Street (Lot 18, Assessor's Block 40) for 50 apartment units for low-income elderly persons is in conformity with the Master Plan.

At 2:05 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 2:15 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

2:15 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

CU70.26 1321 - 26th Avenue, west line, 100 feet south of Irving Street.
Request for expansion of an existing parking lot for the Chapel of the Sunset Mortuary in an R-2 District. (Under advisement from meetings of June 4 and 18, 1970)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the applicant had requested that the application be continued under advisement until the Commission's Zoning Hearing in September.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the subject application be continued under advisement until the meeting of September 3, 1970.

CU70.49 100 Van Ness Avenue, northeast corner of Fell Street.
Consideration of conditions recommended by the staff for Resolution No. 6549.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared a draft resolution containing six conditions to reflect the action taken by the Commission on the subject application at its meeting of June 18, 1970; and he distributed copies of the draft resolution for consideration by the Commission. He stated that the matter had been included on the agenda of the present meeting in order to give the applicant an opportunity to discuss the proposed conditions with the Commission.

THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

8/6/70

Dick Patton, Vice President and General Manager of the California State Automobile Association, stated that the subject property had been acquired by his firm in July, 1968, as the site of a new office building and parking complex; however, plans for the new development had not proceeded according to schedule. Thus, when the lease for the service station on the site had expired, a decision had been made to use the property as a parking lot until such time as the construction project can be undertaken. The parking lot would not provide a great deal of revenue; however, it would provide a better place for employees to park their automobiles than the spaces under the freeway which are leased by AAA at the present time. After the property had been cleared, the Advan Advertising Company had requested permission to place a billboard on the site. AAA had agreed to the proposal providing that Advan could obtain a permit for the billboard; and, once a permit had been obtained, a contract had been signed which would allow the sign to be installed on the property. However, the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning would prohibit billboards on the site; and it was for that reason that he had requested an opportunity to bring the matter before the Commission. He stated that it was doubtful that AAA could legally abrogate the contract with Advan; and, in any case, he felt that abrogation of the contract would not be ethical.

Mr. Patton also remarked on Condition #4 of the draft resolution which would require the installation of landscaping costing approximately \$7,000 on the site; and, since paving of the site would cost an additional \$5,000, at least 3½ years would be required to recover those expenses. Yet, it was hoped that construction of the office building and parking complex would be ready to proceed before the expiration of a 3½ year period. Under the circumstances, he urged that the Commission approve alternate landscaping plans for the site and that it eliminate the prohibition against billboards which was contained in the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Mrs. Porter asked if the alternate landscaping plans had been discussed with the staff. Mr. Patton replied in the affirmative but indicated that the staff had not found the alternate proposal to be acceptable.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that his main concern was that the proposed parking lot would in fact be an interim use of the site; and he wondered if the Commission could be given any assurance that construction of the new building will begin within a specific period of time. Mr. Patton replied that his firm had planned to start construction of the new building last March but had then been advised that the adjacent property, which is owned by the Navy, had been declared surplus. Acquisition of the adjacent property would be extremely desirable; and, if it could be obtained, plans for the new building would probably be changed. He stated that it was his understanding that the disposition of the adjacent property will be determined within the next 12 months. In any case, since purchase of the subject property had required a capital investment of \$276,000, his firm would not be able to afford to have it used as a parking lot for a very long period of time; and, for that reason, he was confident that the construction project would begin within the next three years.

8/6/70

Commissioner Mellon suggested that the revised draft resolution might contain a condition limiting the conditional use authorization to a five-year period. Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the authorization should be limited to a three-year period since the applicants had indicated that they intended to start construction on the new building during that interval.

Mr. Patton confirmed that construction of the new building would probably begin within the next three years; however, authorization of the conditional use for a five-year rather than a three-year period would provide a greater degree of flexibility.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the conditional use authorization could be made contingent upon ownership of the property by the AAA with a clause in the resolution providing that the conditional use authorization would lapse if the property should be sold. Mr. Patton stated that such a condition would be acceptable.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be approved subject to four changes as follows:

1. Removal of the prohibition against billboards on the site.
2. Approval of landscaping in accordance with the alternate landscaping plan which had been submitted by the applicant.
3. Limitation of the conditional use authorization to a five-year period.
4. Provision that the conditional use authorization should be terminated if the property is sold by the California State Automobile Association.

CU70.73 Shriner's Hospital, 1651 - 19th Avenue, between Lawton and Noriega Streets.
Request for modification of conditions contained in Resolution No. 5958 requiring the removal of the old Shriner's Hospital building.
Proposal is to retain the building and convert it into a Masonic Lodge office building; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that he had disqualified himself from review of the subject application because he is a Mason.

Robert Passmore, Planner V - (Zoning), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the Commission had previously authorized construction of a new hospital building immediately to the south of the old building. While the plan had called for the demolition of the old building upon completion of the new hospital facilities, the Shriner's Hospital now wished to retain the main and northern portions of the existing hospital for use as a lodge building for the Islam Temple.

8/6/70

Robert H. Jacobs, Chairman of the Board of the Shriners Hospital, stated that no new use for the old buildings was foreseen when construction of the new hospital was initiated in 1966; and, therefore, the architect had suggested that the old building should be razed and that the site should be used for a parking lot. Since that time, however, the Islam Temple had decided that it would like to move its offices and lodge from downtown San Francisco to the old hospital building; and, as a result, the subject application had been filed requesting permission to maintain the old building in active use. He stated that the Islam Temple would use the hospital building as its local headquarters from which it would coordinate such activities as the East-West game which had previously provided the funds for construction of the new hospital. In conclusion, Mr. Jacobs stated that a new plaza and fountain would be constructed in front of the new hospital building.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the statement made in the case report to the effect that no more than 20 people would attend night meetings in the building was correct. Mr. Jacobs replied in the affirmative. He indicated that the building could not possibly accommodate more than 75 people; and, as a result, larger Shrine meetings would continue to be held in the Shriners' Auditorium or in the facility at 19th Avenue and Sloat Boulevard.

Mr. Taylor, representing the Islam Temple, stated that he had been advised by the headquarters of the Shriners' Hospital, in New Orleans, that the old hospital building may be required at some future date as a research facility for study of burns; and, as a result, he had been requested to find an interim use for the facility. Since the Islam Temple had wished to remove its office activities from the downtown area, he had proposed that those activities should be moved into the old hospital building. If the old hospital building were to be required at some future date for research purposes, another conditional use application would have to be approved by the Commission.

Marguerite Warren, representing the Sunset Neighbors Improvement Club, stated that the members of her organization had originally opposed the closing of Moraga Street for construction of the new hospital building; however, once the project had been approved, they had looked forward to the 400-foot park and garden which had been shown on the original plan as taking the place of the old hospital building. Now that a proposal had been made to retain the old hospital building, she did not have any strong objections; however, she hoped that some assurance could be given that the proposed use of the old building would not add to the parking problems of the neighborhood. She also hoped that a "yo-yo" situation would not develop in which the Shriners' Hospital would return to the City Planning Commission every three years to propose new uses for the site. Miss Warren remarked that the City had previously considered taking an easement on the site which would allow the public to walk through the property without liability to the Shriners; however, that proposal had apparently been abandoned. She also stated that her organization had not received notice of the present hearing; and, since notices for previous hearings had either been received late or not received at all, she wondered if the staff of the Department of City Planning had decided to ignore the neighborhood associations.

8/6/70

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning does try very hard to advise all concerned neighborhood organizations of Zoning Hearings as far in advance as possible; however, because of recent changes in the staff and because of an overload of work, notices of the present hearing had not been mailed to organizations. He apologized for the situation.

Commissioner Newman asked Miss Warren to advise the Commission if her organization fails to receive notices of Zoning Hearings in the future.

The Secretary read letters which had been received from Anita Ruth Sullivan, 1693 - 20th Avenue, and from Mrs. Charles M. Paul, 1719 - 30th Avenue. Mrs. Sullivan stated that the notice of the hearing had not given sufficient information to enable her to determine whether the application should be approved or disapproved. Mrs. Paul opposed the subject application.

The Director recommended that the application be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. He reviewed the conditions which were being proposed, calling particular attention to Condition No. 2 which would enable the Department of City Planning to require that the applicant provide additional off-street parking should it be determined that the operation of the new Shriners' Hospital and the Islam Temple Lodge Building require such additional parking. He then recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

President Newman asked if the conditions were acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Jacobs replied in the affirmative, noting that space is available on the northern portion of the site for provision of any additional parking spaces which might be required by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He also advised the Commission that he had received a letter from N. Colapietro, 1571 - 20th Avenue, endorsing the hospital's plans to retain the existing building.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, remarking that Miss Warren had commented on plans which had previously been discussed to allow the public to walk through the subject property, asked if there would be any restraints, legal or otherwise, to prevent such use of the property by the public. Mr. Jacobs replied in the negative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6576 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioner Newman abstained from voting.

CU70.1 858 - 37th Avenue, east line, 225 feet north of Fulton Street.
Request for increase of occupancy in residential care home from six to eight persons.

8/6/70

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicants had requested permission to expand the occupancy of the residential care home from six to eight persons; and he indicated that the increased number of patients would not require any structural changes in the building.

Lina Breder, the applicant, stated that she had two vacant rooms in her house which she hoped to be able to use for two additional patients. She indicated that her house is very well located for older people. She stated that she pays taxes totaling \$1,200 a year on the property; and, since she handles only low-income patients, the two additional patients being requested would be important in economic terms.

Commissioner Porter asked if the increase in occupancy had been approved by the Department of Public Health. Mrs. Breder replied in the negative.

The Secretary stated that a letter had been received from Grace Dicaprio, R.C.H.A. Licensing Representative for the Department of Social Services, stating that all of the requirements set by the state Department of Social Welfare were being met by the applicant. The Secretary also indicated that six letters had been received from residents of the subject neighborhood in support of the application.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

The Director recommended approval of the application subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After reviewing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

President Newman asked if the conditions were acceptable to the applicant. Mrs. Breder replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6577 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM70.22 Wood Street, west line at Dicha Alley, 470 north of
Geary Boulevard.
R-2 to an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He noted that the property located immediately north of the subject site is currently zoned R-3 and developed with two-story flats; and he indicated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the subject lot from R-2 to R-3 in order to develop the property with five dwelling units. He stated that the property is presently used illegally as a screened storage lot.

8/6/70

Mr. Occhipinti, representing the applicant, stated that the subject property had been leased to the American Terrazzo Co. for the past 20 years. When it had first been acquired by the present owners, it would have been possible to develop it with a building having an R-3 density; however, it had been rezoned R-2 when the new Zoning Ordinance was adopted in 1960. Furthermore, when the new stairway was constructed from Dicha Alley to Lupine Street, a setback had been established for which the owners of the property had not been compensated. In conclusion, Mr. Occhipinti stated that construction on the site of a building with a height of 40 or even 50 feet would not block anyone's views.

A resident of the subject neighborhood stated that she had understood that the whole area is subject to a 40-foot height limit. The Director replied that both the R-2 and the R-3 zoning districts do set a maximum height of 40 feet for residential buildings.

Another lady in the audience asked what type of building the applicants proposed to construct. The Director stated that the application for a change in zone had not been accompanied with plans for any specific building.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

The Director recommended that the application be approved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6578 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CU70.66 350 Masonic Avenue, northeast corner of Golden Gate Avenue.

Request for modification of conditions contained in Resolution No. 6087 to permit construction of a second elevator for the Carew and English Funeral Home.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He indicated that the City Planning Commission had adopted Resolution No. 6087 on February 2, 1967, to change the status of the mortuary from a non-conforming use to a conditional use; and conditions which were contained in that Resolution had specified that no addition should be made to the existing building unless such additions are authorized by the City Planning Commission through the conditional use permit procedure. The applicant now wished to construct a second elevator to be located on the south side of the mortuary; and, as required by the previously adopted resolution, a conditional use application had been filed seeking permission for the new elevator. Mr. Steele stated that the proposed construction would project 6.67 feet from the existing building wall with a maximum width of approximately 16 feet and a height of 26 feet.

Nancy Lunzi, representing the applicant, stated that the new elevator was being proposed for the convenience of elderly customers who are not able to walk up and down stairs. At the present time, the only elevator on the premises is used for freight.

8/6/70

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele remarked that construction of the proposed elevator would have only a slight effect on the exterior appearance of the buildings; and he believed that the expansion would have no effect on the surrounding residential neighborhood. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved subject to two conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6579 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU70.74 3086 Washington Street, north line, 37.5 feet east of Baker Street.
Request for a child care center for 4 to 6 pre-school children in an R-3 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant proposed to use the front wing of the first floor of the single-family residential dwelling as a school for from 4 to 6 pre-school children with special learning problems.

Mary C. Burt, the applicant, stated that she understood that she would have had no need for special zoning consideration if she had proposed to use her home for school-age children; however, she preferred to work with under school-age children since there is so much more hope of helping them. She stated that the proposed school would be in session from 9:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. five days a week; and she indicated that she could stagger the arrival time of the students so that any additional traffic congestion would be avoided. In conclusion, she stated that her closest neighbors had indicated their support of the application.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the school might eventually be expanded if the operation is successful. Miss Burt replied that she has space for only 6 or 8 students. Furthermore, in view of the type of teaching which she wished to offer, a larger group of students would not be desirable.

President Newman asked if Miss Burt would do all of the teaching herself. Miss Burt replied that she has a partner.

Walter Schneider, 38 Washington Street, stated that he was in favor of Miss Burt's proposal.

Mrs. Zimmerman, representing Assemblyman John L. Burton, stated that Mr. Burton has been familiar with the work which has been done by Miss Burt.

It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the

committee on the subject of the

12. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

13. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

14. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

15. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

16. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

17. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

18. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

19. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

20. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

21. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

22. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

23. It was also not proposed in the minutes to be taken by the committee on the subject of the

8/6/70

Because of his interest in getting help for children as young as possible, he supported her application and hoped that it would be approved by the City Planning Commission.

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from Congressman Philip Burton, from Assemblyman John L. Burton, and from Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., in support of the application. He also called attention to letters which had been received from Mrs. James J. Foley, 2108 Baker Street, and from Mr. and Mrs. John R. Green, 2112 Baker Street, in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele remarked that the small number of children to be accommodated by the proposed operation and the high ratio of teachers to children would eliminate any detrimental effect on the surrounding residential neighborhood; and he recommended that the application be approved subject to four specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the four conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Miss Burt stated that the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable to her.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6580 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM70.25 960 and 984 Height Street, north line, 47.5 feet east
 of Broderick Street.
 R-3 to an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested that the property be reclassified from R-3 to R-4 so that it could be combined with another R-4 lot fronting on Broderick Street and used for construction of a 12-story Turnkey Housing Project containing a mixture of family units and units for the elderly. He indicated that a total of 67 dwelling units had been proposed of which 59 would be designed for the elderly and 8 for families. Off-street parking spaces for 17 automobiles would be provided. In conclusion, Mr. Steele advised the Commission that the list of property owners within a 300-foot radius of the subject site which had been provided by the applicant had been found by the staff to be highly erroneous; and, therefore, proper notice had not been given to the public of the hearing on the application. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the hearing be postponed until the meeting of September 3 to enable the staff to obtain a correct list of adjacent property owners and to provide them with adequate notice of the hearing.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 08-01-2001 BY 60322 UCBAW/SJS

[illegible]

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent. This is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years. It is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years. It is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years.

1944-1945

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United Kingdom regarding the proposed changes to the law of the United Kingdom in relation to the treatment of the British Overseas Territories.

1944-1945

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent. This is a fact which is well known to all who are familiar with the country. It is a fact which is well known to all who are familiar with the country. It is a fact which is well known to all who are familiar with the country.

8/6/70

Thomas Hsieh, architect for the applicant, requested permission to describe the project to the Commission. He stated that his client proposed to construct 67 public housing units on the site, 59 of which would be designed for elderly residents and 8 of which would be designed for families. The entrance to the dwelling units for elderly people would be from Broderick Street, and the entrance for families would be from Haight Street. He noted that the subject property had been before the Commission on a number of occasions since 1962; however, none of the previous projects proposed by his clients had been approved. He believed that the project now being proposed would have special merit; and he noted that since the subject parcel of property lies adjacent to property which is already zoned R-4, the reclassification being requested would not constitute "spot zoning". He stated that the property is adjacent to an existing seven-story building which has windows on all four sides; and, as a result, he had designed the proposed building as a tower with minimum coverage so as to provide a maximum amount of open space on the site. He stated that plans for the building had been reviewed with the Urban Design Section of the Department of City Planning and had received their approval. The plans had also been reviewed by the Housing Authority but had not yet been accepted by that Department.

Commissioner Fleishhacker emphasized that the subject application involved only the proposed reclassification of the site from R-3 to R-4 and not the type of building to be constructed on the property.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reiterated the point which had been made by Commissioner Fleishhacker. He also remarked that he is responsible for making recommendations on matters submitted to the Department of City Planning; and, although the proposed Turnkey Housing Project might have been discussed with other members of the staff, he had not yet given the proposal his approval.

T. W. Washington, 1908 Divisadero, stated that he had been a Realtor for the past 24 years. He advised the Commission that the proposed project is needed in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that it would benefit the entire community. Therefore, he was in favor of the proposed reclassification.

Steven Arian, Attorney, represented his father who is one of the owners of a parcel of property located in the subject neighborhood, stated that the notice of the public hearing had been sent to a vacant lot instead of to the address indicated on the Assessor's records; and, as a result, he had not had sufficient time to prepare an argument in opposition to the applicant's request.

Mr. Steele stated that a number of notices had been returned to the Department of City Planning because they had been addressed incorrectly on the basis of the erroneous list which had been supplied to the Department by the applicant. Earlier in the day, a letter had been received from an official in the Assessor's Office testifying to the correctness of the list which had been submitted by the applicant; however, when the list had been checked by a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning, 37 deviations from the listings in the Assessor's Office had been found. Under the circumstances, he felt that adequate notice had not been given to the public; and, therefore, he recommended that the hearing be postponed until the meeting of September 3.

8/6/70

Commissioner Porter questioned the advisability of relying upon lists of property owners provided by applicants. The Director replied that to the best of his knowledge this was the first time that an erroneous list had been given to the Department in the past three years. Since the notices of the hearing had not been sent to the correct addresses, he felt that due process may not have been served; and, as a result, he supported Mr. Steele's recommendation for postponement of the hearing.

Mr. Steele advised the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning usually "spot checks" lists of property owners submitted by applicants; however, because of lack of available staff, the list which had been submitted by the applicant in the present instance had not been checked in that manner.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the application form provided to applicants contains a statement to the effect that the accuracy of their list of property owners is important and that any inaccuracies may result in postponement of the hearing to be held by the Commission. Mr. Steele replied in the negative. Commissioner Ritchie then suggested that such a statement should be included on the forms.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the hearing be postponed until the meeting of September 3, 1970.

Mr. Arian stated that he would not be able to be present on September 3 and asked for an opportunity to make a statement at the present time. He indicated that most of the subject neighborhood is zoned and developed in accordance with R-3 standards; and, even if the neighborhood were zoned R-4, the 12-story tower being proposed by the applicant would be inappropriate for the area. He stated that the property owned by his father, which is zoned R-4, had previously been offered to the Housing Authority refusing the offer of the site. The main objections expressed in the letter were that the site is located too close to the Haight-Ashbury District and that the extreme slope of the streets would make access to the site difficult for elderly people. He remarked that the slope of the property presently under consideration is slightly greater than the slope of the property owned by his father; and he noted that the site is located in "hippieville". Furthermore, whereas the property owned by his father was already included in an R-4 District, the present applicant would have to obtain a change of zone from R-3 to R-4 in order to proceed with his project.

Mr. Hsieh advised the Commission that a letter had been written earlier in the day by the principal investigator of the Tax Collector's Office certifying that the list of property owners which had been submitted to the Department of City Planning was accurate. Under the circumstances, he felt that it would be unfair for the Commission to postpone the scheduled hearing, especially since the same notices would be returned to the Department of City Planning if the same list were used to advise property owners of the September 3 hearing. He remarked that the standards of the Housing Authority for housing for the elderly are extremely high; and the Agency reserves the right to accept the best proposals which may be offered even though two alternate sites may be only one block apart. He was confident that the project which he had designed would be acceptable to the Housing Authority; and he urged the Commission to approve the subject application.

The Commission has received the information of various sources that at present there is no possibility of a settlement of the dispute between the Government and the Opposition. The Commission has been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Commission has also been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Commission has also been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Commission has also been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Commission has also been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

The Commission has also been informed that the Government is not prepared to accept the terms of the Opposition's proposal. The Commission has also been informed that the Opposition is not prepared to accept the terms of the Government's proposal. The Commission has therefore decided to continue its efforts to bring about a settlement of the dispute.

8/6/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he assumed that the Department of City Planning would not use the same list of addresses if new notices were to be sent to adjacent property owners advising of the hearing to be held on September 3. Mr. Steele confirmed that fact and indicated that he would personally check the list against the Assessor's records because of the statement of certification which had been received from the Tax Collector's Office.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to postpone the hearing of the subject application until the meeting of September 3, 1970.

At 4:05 p.m. President Newman announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:15 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

CU70.76 All of the block bounded by Thomas and Underwood Avenues and Fitch and Griffith Streets; and the southeastern portion of the block bounded by Thomas and Shafter Avenues and Fitch and Griffith Streets. Request for an automobile wrecking yard in an M-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property, composing the larger part of two blocks, is zoned M-1 and is largely vacant and unimproved. The property is located approximately 800 feet from the nearest residential district and is not visible from that district. Thomas Avenue, which separates the two blocks, is unimproved. He stated that the applicants had proposed to develop an automobile wrecking yard on the property with sale of used auto parts on the same premises. Two operators would be located on the northerly block. The southerly block would be developed in two phases. During the first phase, three automobile dismantlers would be located on the site; in the second phase, the site would be developed for use by one operator only.

Alan B. Axelrod, Attorney for the applicants, stated that he and his clients had met with the staff of the Department of City Planning on a number of occasions to discuss the proposed use of the subject property. He indicated that he was aware that the staff would recommend that a number of conditions be established if the Commission were willing to approve the subject application; and he remarked that he would like to have an opportunity to review the conditions before making his presentation since the conditions would ultimately affect the design and financing of the project.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that he would not be prepared to recommend approval or disapproval of the subject application until he had had an opportunity to hear from individuals speaking in favor of and in opposition to the proposal. However, conditions had been prepared which the staff of the Department of City Planning felt should be met if the application were to be approved; and he indicated that he would be willing to read those conditions if the Commission so desired.

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to define the problem. This involves identifying the symptoms of the problem and determining the scope of the problem. Once the problem has been defined, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves identifying the factors that are contributing to the problem and determining the underlying causes. Once the causes have been identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This involves identifying the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and determining the resources that will be needed to implement the plan. Once a plan of action has been developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that have been identified in the plan and monitoring the progress of the implementation. Finally, the last step in the process is to evaluate the results of the implementation. This involves determining whether the problem has been solved and whether the resources have been used effectively.

[illegible]

On 10th June, President's Council announced a 10-20-30-40-50-60-70-80-90-100-110-120-130-140-150-160-170-180-190-200-210-220-230-240-250-260-270-280-290-300-310-320-330-340-350-360-370-380-390-400-410-420-430-440-450-460-470-480-490-500-510-520-530-540-550-560-570-580-590-600-610-620-630-640-650-660-670-680-690-700-710-720-730-740-750-760-770-780-790-800-810-820-830-840-850-860-870-880-890-900-910-920-930-940-950-960-970-980-990-1000-1010-1020-1030-1040-1050-1060-1070-1080-1090-1100-1110-1120-1130-1140-1150-1160-1170-1180-1190-1200-1210-1220-1230-1240-1250-1260-1270-1280-1290-1300-1310-1320-1330-1340-1350-1360-1370-1380-1390-1400-1410-1420-1430-1440-1450-1460-1470-1480-1490-1500-1510-1520-1530-1540-1550-1560-1570-1580-1590-1600-1610-1620-1630-1640-1650-1660-1670-1680-1690-1700-1710-1720-1730-1740-1750-1760-1770-1780-1790-1800-1810-1820-1830-1840-1850-1860-1870-1880-1890-1900-1910-1920-1930-1940-1950-1960-1970-1980-1990-2000-2010-2020-2030-2040-2050-2060-2070-2080-2090-2100-2110-2120-2130-2140-2150-2160-2170-2180-2190-2200-2210-2220-2230-2240-2250-2260-2270-2280-2290-2300-2310-2320-2330-2340-2350-2360-2370-2380-2390-2400-2410-2420-2430-2440-2450-2460-2470-2480-2490-2500-2510-2520-2530-2540-2550-2560-2570-2580-2590-2600-2610-2620-2630-2640-2650-2660-2670-2680-2690-2700-2710-2720-2730-2740-2750-2760-2770-2780-2790-2800-2810-2820-2830-2840-2850-2860-2870-2880-2890-2900-2910-2920-2930-2940-2950-2960-2970-2980-2990-3000-3010-3020-3030-3040-3050-3060-3070-3080-3090-3100-3110-3120-3130-3140-3150-3160-3170-3180-3190-3200-3210-3220-3230-3240-3250-3260-3270-3280-3290-3300-3310-3320-3330-3340-3350-3360-3370-3380-3390-3400-3410-3420-3430-3440-3450-3460-3470-3480-3490-3500-3510-3520-3530-3540-3550-3560-3570-3580-3590-3600-3610-3620-3630-3640-3650-3660-3670-3680-3690-3700-3710-3720-3730-3740-3750-3760-3770-3780-3790-3800-3810-3820-3830-3840-3850-3860-3870-3880-3890-3900-3910-3920-3930-3940-3950-3960-3970-3980-3990-4000-4010-4020-4030-4040-4050-4060-4070-4080-4090-4100-4110-4120-4130-4140-4150-4160-4170-4180-4190-4200-4210-4220-4230-4240-4250-4260-4270-4280-4290-4300-4310-4320-4330-4340-4350-4360-4370-4380-4390-4400-4410-4420-4430-4440-4450-4460-4470-4480-4490-4500-4510-4520-4530-4540-4550-4560-4570-4580-4590-4600-4610-4620-4630-4640-4650-4660-4670-4680-4690-4700-4710-4720-4730-4740-4750-4760-4770-4780-4790-4800-4810-4820-4830-4840-4850-4860-4870-4880-4890-4900-4910-4920-4930-4940-4950-4960-4970-4980-4990-5000-5010-5020-5030-5040-5050-5060-5070-5080-5090-5100-5110-5120-5130-5140-5150-5160-5170-5180-5190-5200-5210-5220-5230-5240-5250-5260-5270-5280-5290-5300-5310-5320-5330-5340-5350-5360-5370-5380-5390-5400-5410-5420-5430-5440-5450-5460-5470-5480-5490-5500-5510-5520-5530-5540-5550-5560-5570-5580-5590-5600-5610-5620-5630-5640-5650-5660-5670-5680-5690-5700-5710-5720-5730-5740-5750-5760-5770-5780-5790-5800-5810-5820-5830-5840-5850-5860-5870-5880-5890-5900-5910-5920-5930-5940-5950-5960-5970-5980-5990-6000-6010-6020-6030-6040-6050-6060-6070-6080-6090-6100-6110-6120-6130-6140-6150-6160-6170-6180-6190-6200-6210-6220-6230-6240-6250-6260-6270-6280-6290-6300-6310-6320-6330-6340-6350-6360-6370-6380-6390-6400-6410-6420-6430-6440-6450-6460-6470-6480-6490-6500-6510-6520-6530-6540-6550-6560-6570-6580-6590-6600-6610-6620-6630-6640-6650-6660-6670-6680-6690-6700-6710-6720-6730-6740-6750-6760-6770-6780-6790-6800-6810-6820-6830-6840-6850-6860-6870-6880-6890-6900-6910-6920-6930-6940-6950-6960-6970-6980-6990-7000-7010-7020-7030-7040-7050-7060-7070-7080-7090-7100-7110-7120-7130-7140-7150-7160-7170-7180-7190-7200-7210-7220-7230-7240-7250-7260-7270-7280-7290-7300-7310-7320-7330-7340-7350-7360-7370-7380-7390-7400-7410-7420-7430-7440-7450-7460-7470-7480-7490-7500-7510-7520-7530-7540-7550-7560-7570-7580-7590-7600-7610-7620-7630-7640-7650-7660-7670-7680-7690-7700-7710-7720-7730-7740-7750-7760-7770-7780-7790-7800-7810-7820-7830-7840-7850-7860-7870-7880-7890-7900-7910-7920-7930-7940-7950-7960-7970-7980-7990-8000-8010-8020-8030-8040-8050-8060-8070-8080-8090-8100-8110-8120-8130-8140-8150-8160-8170-8180-8190-8200-8210-8220-8230-8240-8250-8260-8270-8280-8290-8300-8310-8320-8330-8340-8350-8360-8370-8380

...the same of
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

1. The above information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be used for any other purpose. It is not to be distributed outside your organization.

[illegible]

8/6/70

Commissioner Porter felt that the Commission should hear from members of the audience before entering upon a discussion of the proposed conditions.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that it might be appropriate for the staff to summarize the general guidelines for review of conditional use applications for automobile wrecking yards which were established by City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6358 which was adopted on April 3, 1969. Mr. Steele summarized those guidelines as follows:

"Time limits may be set on the duration of a conditional use approval on the basis of Master Plans for the area, anticipated future development or other considerations. Location should be evaluated in terms of current land use in the area; the visibility of the site from other locations and areas of the city, especially as these areas are affected by topography; proximity of Residential Public and Commercial zoning districts; accessibility of the proposed location from freeways and major thoroughfares; patterns of traffic to be generated by the proposed wrecking yard in relation to nearby residential and other development. In considering compatibility with neighboring land uses, both industrial and residential, the City Planning Commission may require total enclosure within a building of the auto dismantling operation. Wrecking yards should be located not less than 500 feet from any Residential or Public zoning district, but exceptions may be made where there are intervening uses or exceptional separation due to topography or screening. The necessity for and type of fencing required depends on the character of surrounding uses, visual and topographic factors, and requirements of other Departments. Normally a fence at least 8 feet high should be constructed and maintained; openings in the fence should be no larger than 15 feet wide and have gates or doors of the same height and consistent in character with the fencing. When the wrecking yard is not open for business, the gates or doors should be kept securely closed. Generally, open storage of vehicles or parts should not exceed the height of the fence or 10 feet, whichever is higher. No storage is permitted on roofs. The hours of operation may be limited where necessary to protect nearby properties. The Commission should review the plans for provision of aisles and adequate spacing to separate stores materials; provision of a suitable location location on the property for safe-keeping of required records; surfacing of the site with gravel or hardtop or other appropriate manner; adequate drainage facilities to prevent accumulation of water on the site; connection with a sanitary sewer, when available. Other conditions may be imposed by the Commission, consistent with the general conditional use criteria."

Commissioner Newman asked if it would be possible for additional conditions to be recommended in any specific case under consideration by the Commission. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Axelrod stated that he believed that the plans which had been submitted to the Department of City Planning had conformed with the general guidelines which had just been read by Mr. Steele. He indicated, however, that the cost of street and sewer work in the area may be higher than had originally been anticipated; and, even if his clients could afford those costs, the expense might be so great as to have a drastic effect on the development of the subject site itself.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the streets in the subject neighborhood are largely unimproved; and, if the subject application were to be approved, he felt that a condition would have to be established requiring some street improvements.

Commissioner Mellon agreed; however, he felt that the Commission should not concern itself with the cost of such improvements but rather with the merits of the application presently under consideration.

Mr. Axelrod suggested that it might be desirable to postpone the hearing on the subject application to enable the applicants to discuss the matter of street improvements with the Department of Public Works. If the streets could be improved by grading and covered with gravel, the cost would be considerably less than construction of paved streets with sidewalks.

President Newman stated that the issue of concern to Mr. Axelrod would inevitably have to be resolved by the applicants themselves; and, even if the subject application were to be approved by the Commission, the applicants would not have to proceed with the project if they did not feel that it would be financially feasible.

Mr. Axelrod stated that he had no further comments to make in support of the application which had already been submitted to the staff of the Department of City Planning.

No one else was present in the meeting room to speak in favor of the subject application.

Harold B. Brooks, Jr., Chairman of the Bay View-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Agency, stated that his organization had met on the previous evening to discuss the subject application and had voted to reaffirm the position which it had originally taken several months ago. He stated that the members of the Model Neighborhood Agency were sympathetic to the problems of the auto dismantlers; however, they were also faced with responsibility for the rejuvenation of a neglected neighborhood. They felt that once the automobile wreckers are allowed to become established in their neighborhood, the task of improving the neighborhood with new housing and other amenities would be made all the more difficult. Since the automobile dismantlers are being displaced from the Butcher-town area by the Redevelopment Agency, he felt that the Redevelopment Agency

8/6/70

should aid the dismantlers in their effort to find a new site in a suitable location; and, if a suitable location cannot be found immediately, he felt that the Redevelopment Agency should grant additional time before requiring the removal of automobile dismantling activities from the Butchertown area. Mr. Brooks advised the Commission that many people presently living in the South Bayshore area may not be able to afford the new housing which is being proposed unless the number of jobs per acre can be increased; and he indicated that the auto dismantling industry provides jobs for very few people. He believed that another location could be found for the auto dismantlers which would offer many of the same advantages as the subject site; and, if necessary, he felt that the Redevelopment Agency should provide additional money to enable the automobile dismantlers to acquire sites in those areas. During the interim, he hoped that the City Planning Commission would disapprove the subject application; and he suggested that there should be further cooperation between the Redevelopment Agency, the Model Neighborhood Agency and the City Planning Commission to find a solution to the relocation problem of the auto dismantlers.

Commissioner Porter asked if Mr. Brooks really could suggest an alternate site for the proposed automobile wrecking yard which would be acceptable to people living nearby. She remarked that whereas everyone seems to have sympathy for the automobile dismantlers, no one is willing to have such activities located in their neighborhood.

Mr. Brooks replied that he thought that a more suitable location for the automobile wrecking activities would be in the area now occupied by the Scavengers; however, he did not know whether such a use would be acceptable to people living in that neighborhood. Fort Funston and other sandy areas in the city might also be appropriate for automobile wrecking activities; however, many people might disagree with such a proposal. In any case, the members of the Model Neighborhood Agency had taken the position that such uses should not be located in the South Bayshore area which has been badly neglected in the past. He felt that the matter should be studied further; and, eventually, a conclusion might be reached that tax relief or some similar device might be used to enable the automobile dismantlers to remain in business without infringing on the rights of others.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that one of the standards which had been established by the City Planning Commission in April, 1969, was that automobile wrecking yards should be located not less than 500 feet from residential districts; and he noted that the property presently under consideration is located approximately 800 feet from the nearest residential district. Thus, while the proposal seemed to meet the standards which had previously been adopted by the Commission, it was obvious that the standards themselves were not acceptable to the community. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was possible that the guidelines which had been established by the Commission should be reconsidered; and, if so, he hoped that representatives of the community, such as Mr. Brooks, would advise the Commission of guidelines which they might consider to be

[illegible]

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to determine the nature of the problem. This involves a thorough understanding of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the nature of the problem is understood, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves a detailed analysis of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the causes of the problem are identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action. This involves determining the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and the resources that will be required to implement the plan. Once a plan of action has been developed, the next step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that have been identified in the plan of action. Finally, the last step in the process is to evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in solving the problem and whether the resources have been used effectively.

8/6/70

appropriate.

Mr. Brooks stated that his Agency had previously recommended that automobile dismantling activities be restricted to enclosed buildings; however, it was obvious that such a restriction would require an increased expense beyond the amount which the dismantlers would be willing to pay. If automobile dismantling is a necessary function, it seemed to him that the problem of finding a suitable location for the industry should be the responsibility of the entire city; and he did not feel that it was fair to repeatedly place his neighborhood in the position of "being the bad guy and having to say 'no'." He did not regard the Commission's guideline requiring that automobile wrecking yards be located not less than 500 feet from any residential district to be satisfactory; and, in fact, he felt that such a guideline would inevitably create more problems than it would solve.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that automobile wrecking activities are an industrial use and must be located in the industrial areas; and there are no industrial sites of sufficient size to accommodate the needs of the automobile wreckers in San Francisco except for the South Bayshore area. Although the use might be acceptable to the community if it were to be housed in an enclosed building, it was apparent that the automobile wreckers could not afford such facilities. He stated that the Commission was anxious to preserve the automobile wrecking industry in San Francisco because several hundred jobs are involved; and he wondered if Mr. Brooks could recommend any specific site for the industry within the city limits of San Francisco.

Mr. Brooks answered that it might be possible to develop smaller automobile wrecking yards around and under freeways or even within small buildings on scattered sites. The land beneath the freeways is publicly owned; and, if the automobile dismantlers were able to acquire such properties at a low cost, they would be able to afford the construction of buildings to enclose their activities. He did not regard the problem as being significantly different from the problem of garbage disposal; and he felt that the community, working together, should be able to find a satisfactory solution to the problem. However, only if the Commission were willing to take the position that the South Bayshore area should become the cesspool of San Francisco should the application be approved; and, if the Commission should not be willing to commit itself to that sort of policy, it should accept the recommendation of the Model Neighborhood Agency and disapprove the application.

Juanita Stone, representing the staff of the Model Neighborhood Agency, stated that she and the other members of the staff had been hired to give advice on technical matters; and she felt it was imperative to warn the Commission that the location of any automobile wrecking yard in the South Bayshore area would not be in the interests of the Bayview-Hunters Point community, that it would contradict the improvements recommended in the South Bayshore Plan, and that it would conflict with the recommendations being prepared by the Model Neighborhood Agency for presentation to the Board of Supervisors. She stated that a 701 Planning Grant had been made available to provide for a feasibility study which will determine how land in the subject neighborhood should be used; and, until such time as that study is completed, the Model Neighborhood Agency

8/6/70

will not be in a position to decide whether the vacant property presently under consideration should be used for a hospital or for some other purpose. Under the circumstances, she felt that the arbitrary placement of an automobile wrecking yard on the property would be an example of poor judgment.

Miss Stone commented on the fact that industrial land in the South Bayshore area is under-developed; and she noted that junk yards and warehouses provide jobs for only a few people. She stated that Butchertown employs only 23.3 employees per acre or 1,474 full-time employees. In San Francisco as a whole, the ratio of the value of improvements to the value of the land is \$1.51 of improvements for each \$1.00 of assessed land value. The ratio in various districts of the city ranges from a high of \$2.25 of improvements for each \$1.00 of assessed land value to a low of 92¢ of improvements for each \$1.00 of land value; and the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood is located in the district with the lowest ratio. The 15 blocks in the Butchertown area which have been occupied by automobile wrecking yards have had a ratio of 36¢ of improvements for each \$1.00 of assessed land value. Given those ratios, she felt that it was obvious why the proposed automobile wrecking yard would not be a desirable land use for the subject neighborhood; and, in fact, the Model Neighborhood Agency had already voted to oppose a similar installation which was proposed previously.

Charles Louis, Economics Liaison Officer for the Model Neighborhood Agency, advised the Commission that the plan which had been prepared by the Model Neighborhood Agency had allocated \$1,000,000 to be spent on economic development studies. While he regarded the subject property as an eye-sore at the present time, he could not recommend an appropriate use for the property until funds have been made available and a study has been made of potential developments. In order to explain the problem in greater detail, he read from a telegram which had been addressed to the Director of City Planning and the Executive Director of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, by Harold B. Brooks, Jr., Chairman of the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Commission, as follows:

"WE STRONGLY URGE YOUR FULL SUPPORT IN THE REJECTION OF THE LOCATION IF (SIC) AUTO DISMATLERS (SIC) IN THE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD AREA. OUR BAYVIEW HUNTERS MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 4 1970 AND AGAIN ON AUGUST 5 1970 OVERWHELMINGLY OPPOSED THIS AUTO DISMANTLING OPERATION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

"1) IT CONTINUES THE UNECONOMICAL USE OF LAND IN OUR MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD, DISCOURAGING THOSE INDUSTRIES WITH MUCH HIGHER REVENUE PRODUCING BASE AND ALSO EMPLOY LARGER NUMBERS OF RESIDENTS FROM LOCATING IN THE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD AREA.

"2) AUTO DISMANTLERS AND SIMILAR OPERATIONS HAVE A BAD HISTORY OF WASTEFUL LAND-USE WHICH THEIR NEW PROPOSAL SHOWS NO SIGN OF IMPROVING. ACCORDING TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY LAND-USE SURVEY OF 1968 IN THE INDIA BASIN AUTO WRECKING AND SALVAGE OPERATIONS USE NEARLY 40 PER CENT OF THE LAND BUT ONLY EMPLOY 7 PERCENT OF THE WHOLE BUTCHER-TOWN LABOR FORCE; AND THIS WAS ONLY 104 WORKERS.

will not be in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

This is a very important point to be considered in the case of the Government. The Government is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

The Government is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

The Government is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

The Government is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

The Government is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, is in a position to deal with the various property interests which would be involved in a transfer of the land to the Government.

8/6/70

"3) AUTO WRECKING AND SALVAGE OPERATIONS NOW USE ONLY 4.2 EMPLOYEES PER ACRE OF LAND. THIS PROVIDES LITTLE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES (SIC) FOR RESIDENTS; FAR LESS THAN 40 EMPLOYEES PER ACRE STANDARD RECOMMENDED FOR ANY INDUSTRY LOCATING IN THE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD BY THE MODEL CITIES TASK FORCE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT. ALMOST ANY OTHER INDUSTRY EMPLOYS MORE PEOPLE ON THE SAME AMOUNT OF LAND.

"4) UNENCLOSED AUTO DISMANTLING (FROM ALL DIRECTIONS) GIVES THE NEIGHBORHOOD AN UNDESIRABLE APPEARANCE AND THUS, IN ADDITION MAKING IT LESS PLEASANT PLACE TO LIVE IN FOR RESIDENTS, IT REDUCES PROPERTY VALUES (I.E., NOBODY WANTS TO BUY A HOME NEAR OR OVERLOOKING A "JUNK YARD").

"5) THIS INDUSTRY'S TRUCKING ACTIVITY PRESENTS SAFETY HAZARDS AND TRAFFIC CONGESTION PROBLEMS TO THE COMMUNITY. THE TRUCKS USUALLY OVERLOADED WITH SCRAP OR JUNK CARS ARE DIFFICULT TO SEE AROUND, DROP RUSTED AND JAGGED PIECES ON THE ROAD, AND ARE A NUISANCE LEFT PARKED ON THE STREET.

"WE ARE IN SYMPATHY WITH THE DILEMMA (SIC) THE AUTO WRECKERS FACE AND IT WOULD SEEM TO US THAT THIS UNFORTUNATE SITUATION THAT THE AUTO WRECKERS FIND THEMSELVES IN IS MORE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO DEAL WITH UNDER THE GUIDELINES OF BUSINESS RELOCATION PROCEDURES.

"WE GREATLY URGE YOUR SUPPORT IN THIS MATTER. THIS SUPPORT OF NECESSITY IS URGENTLY NEEDED IF THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN NOW BEING SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS IS TO HAVE ANY REAL MEANING."

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that it was apparent from the comments which had been made that residents of the subject neighborhood did not wish to have an automobile wrecking yard located in the Bayview-Hunters Point district or in Butchertown no matter what conditions might be established by the Commission; however, if those areas were to be ruled out, he wondered if any suggestion could be made as to which areas the City might turn to for location of the automobile wrecking industry. Mr. Louis stated that he had no suggestions in that regard at the present time.

Reuel Brady remarked that the Butchertown Redevelopment Project had been undertaken because the area was devoted to automobile wrecking uses which did not provide jobs; and he felt that it was strange that a proposal should now be made to move those uses 10 blocks away and to change the nature of the uses only by adding a few conditions. Yet, residents of the subject neighborhood were clearly advising the Commission that they did not wish to have any junk yards located in their neighborhood whether they be beautiful or not. Such a situation might pose a dilemma for the members of the City Planning Commission; but he did not understand why the wrecking yards should be relocated in the same general neighborhood when residents of the area are trying to make it into a model neighborhood with jobs, new residences, and open space along the shoreline.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED EXCEPT WHERE SHOWN OTHERWISE. DATE 08-22-2001 BY 60322 UCBAW

1. The following information was obtained from the records of the
2. FBI, New York Office, dated 10/10/68, and 10/11/68, and 10/12/68,
3. and 10/13/68, and 10/14/68, and 10/15/68, and 10/16/68, and 10/17/68,
4. and 10/18/68, and 10/19/68, and 10/20/68, and 10/21/68, and 10/22/68,
5. and 10/23/68, and 10/24/68, and 10/25/68, and 10/26/68, and 10/27/68,
6. and 10/28/68, and 10/29/68, and 10/30/68, and 10/31/68, and 11/1/68,
7. and 11/2/68, and 11/3/68, and 11/4/68, and 11/5/68, and 11/6/68, and 11/7/68,
8. and 11/8/68, and 11/9/68, and 11/10/68, and 11/11/68, and 11/12/68, and 11/13/68,
9. and 11/14/68, and 11/15/68, and 11/16/68, and 11/17/68, and 11/18/68, and 11/19/68,
10. and 11/20/68, and 11/21/68, and 11/22/68, and 11/23/68, and 11/24/68, and 11/25/68,
11. and 11/26/68, and 11/27/68, and 11/28/68, and 11/29/68, and 11/30/68, and 12/1/68,
12. and 12/2/68, and 12/3/68, and 12/4/68, and 12/5/68, and 12/6/68, and 12/7/68, and 12/8/68,
13. and 12/9/68, and 12/10/68, and 12/11/68, and 12/12/68, and 12/13/68, and 12/14/68, and 12/15/68,
14. and 12/16/68, and 12/17/68, and 12/18/68, and 12/19/68, and 12/20/68, and 12/21/68, and 12/22/68,
15. and 12/23/68, and 12/24/68, and 12/25/68, and 12/26/68, and 12/27/68, and 12/28/68, and 12/29/68,
16. and 12/30/68, and 12/31/68, and 1/1/69, and 1/2/69, and 1/3/69, and 1/4/69, and 1/5/69, and 1/6/69,
17. and 1/7/69, and 1/8/69, and 1/9/69, and 1/10/69, and 1/11/69, and 1/12/69, and 1/13/69, and 1/14/69,
18. and 1/15/69, and 1/16/69, and 1/17/69, and 1/18/69, and 1/19/69, and 1/20/69, and 1/21/69, and 1/22/69,
19. and 1/23/69, and 1/24/69, and 1/25/69, and 1/26/69, and 1/27/69, and 1/28/69, and 1/29/69, and 1/30/69,
20. and 1/31/69, and 2/1/69, and 2/2/69, and 2/3/69, and 2/4/69, and 2/5/69, and 2/6/69, and 2/7/69, and 2/8/69,
21. and 2/9/69, and 2/10/69, and 2/11/69, and 2/12/69, and 2/13/69, and 2/14/69, and 2/15/69, and 2/16/69,
22. and 2/17/69, and 2/18/69, and 2/19/69, and 2/20/69, and 2/21/69, and 2/22/69, and 2/23/69, and 2/24/69,
23. and 2/25/69, and 2/26/69, and 2/27/69, and 2/28/69, and 2/29/69, and 2/30/69, and 3/1/69, and 3/2/69,
24. and 3/3/69, and 3/4/69, and 3/5/69, and 3/6/69, and 3/7/69, and 3/8/69, and 3/9/69, and 3/10/69, and 3/11/69,
25. and 3/12/69, and 3/13/69, and 3/14/69, and 3/15/69, and 3/16/69, and 3/17/69, and 3/18/69, and 3/19/69,
26. and 3/20/69, and 3/21/69, and 3/22/69, and 3/23/69, and 3/24/69, and 3/25/69, and 3/26/69, and 3/27/69,
27. and 3/28/69, and 3/29/69, and 3/30/69, and 3/31/69, and 4/1/69, and 4/2/69, and 4/3/69, and 4/4/69, and 4/5/69,
28. and 4/6/69, and 4/7/69, and 4/8/69, and 4/9/69, and 4/10/69, and 4/11/69, and 4/12/69, and 4/13/69, and 4/14/69,
29. and 4/15/69, and 4/16/69, and 4/17/69, and 4/18/69, and 4/19/69, and 4/20/69, and 4/21/69, and 4/22/69, and 4/23/69,
30. and 4/24/69, and 4/25/69, and 4/26/69, and 4/27/69, and 4/28/69, and 4/29/69, and 4/30/69, and 5/1/69, and 5/2/69,
31. and 5/3/69, and 5/4/69, and 5/5/69, and 5/6/69, and 5/7/69, and 5/8/69, and 5/9/69, and 5/10/69, and 5/11/69,
32. and 5/12/69, and 5/13/69, and 5/14/69, and 5/15/69, and 5/16/69, and 5/17/69, and 5/18/69, and 5/19/69, and 5/20/69,
33. and 5/21/69, and 5/22/69, and 5/23/69, and 5/24/69, and 5/25/69, and 5/26/69, and 5/27/69, and 5/28/69, and 5/29/69,
34. and 5/30/69, and 5/31/69, and 6/1/69, and 6/2/69, and 6/3/69, and 6/4/69, and 6/5/69, and 6/6/69, and 6/7/69, and 6/8/69,
35. and 6/9/69, and 6/10/69, and 6/11/69, and 6/12/69, and 6/13/69, and 6/14/69, and 6/15/69, and 6/16/69, and 6/17/69,
36. and 6/18/69, and 6/19/69, and 6/20/69, and 6/21/69, and 6/22/69, and 6/23/69, and 6/24/69, and 6/25/69, and 6/26/69,
37. and 6/27/69, and 6/28/69, and 6/29/69, and 6/30/69, and 7/1/69, and 7/2/69, and 7/3/69, and 7/4/69, and 7/5/69, and 7/6/69,
38. and 7/7/69, and 7/8/69, and 7/9/69, and 7/10/69, and 7/11/69, and 7/12/69, and 7/13/69, and 7/14/69, and 7/15/69, and 7/16/69,
39. and 7/17/69, and 7/18/69, and 7/19/69, and 7/20/69, and 7/21/69, and 7/22/69, and 7/23/69, and 7/24/69, and 7/25/69, and 7/26/69,
40. and 7/27/69, and 7/28/69, and 7/29/69, and 7/30/69, and 7/31/69, and 8/1/69, and 8/2/69, and 8/3/69, and 8/4/69, and 8/5/69, and 8/6/69,
41. and 8/7/69, and 8/8/69, and 8/9/69, and 8/10/69, and 8/11/69, and 8/12/69, and 8/13/69, and 8/14/69, and 8/15/69, and 8/16/69, and 8/17/69,
42. and 8/18/69, and 8/19/69, and 8/20/69, and 8/21/69, and 8/22/69, and 8/23/69, and 8/24/69, and 8/25/69, and 8/26/69, and 8/27/69,
43. and 8/28/69, and 8/29/69, and 8/30/69, and 8/31/69, and 9/1/69, and 9/2/69, and 9/3/69, and 9/4/69, and 9/5/69, and 9/6/69, and 9/7/69,
44. and 9/8/69, and 9/9/69, and 9/10/69, and 9/11/69, and 9/12/69, and 9/13/69, and 9/14/69, and 9/15/69, and 9/16/69, and 9/17/69, and 9/18/69,
45. and 9/19/69, and 9/20/69, and 9/21/69, and 9/22/69, and 9/23/69, and 9/24/69, and 9/25/69, and 9/26/69, and 9/27/69, and 9/28/69, and 9/29/69,
46. and 9/30/69, and 10/1/69, and 10/2/69, and 10/3/69, and 10/4/69, and 10/5/69, and 10/6/69, and 10/7/69, and 10/8/69, and 10/9/69, and 10/10/69,
47. and 10/11/69, and 10/12/69, and 10/13/69, and 10/14/69, and 10/15/69, and 10/16/69, and 10/17/69, and 10/18/69, and 10/19/69, and 10/20/69, and 10/21/69,
48. and 10/22/69, and 10/23/69, and 10/24/69, and 10/25/69, and 10/26/69, and 10/27/

8/6/70

Mr. Peeters, representing Peeters Van and Storage, stated that neither his firm nor 50 other property owners in the area had received notice of the present hearing in spite of the fact that they had requested to be put on a mailing list for any proposals which might affect the properties within the area of the South Bayshore Plan. He stated that the furniture warehouse industry had recently been forced to face the problem of relocation; and he indicated that at least five furniture warehouses had been relocated to the subject neighborhood since 1960 at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. In spite of the extreme fire hazard in the Hunters Point area, approximately 40% of the business of the furniture warehouses comes from the Armed Services; however, if the fire hazard were to be increased by the installation of automobile wrecking yards, they would probably lose the business now being provided by the Armed Services. Mr. Peeters remarked that the furniture warehouses had not come to the Commission for special help when they had been forced to relocate; instead, they had moved into a new area, had paved streets, and had tried to upgrade the neighborhood at a considerable cost. If the subject application were to be approved, and if steps are taken in the future to implement the South Bayshore Plan, he wondered what would happen to the automobile wrecking yard at that point. He stated that he objected to the proposed use; and he indicated that he would object to having gravel streets in an area where his industry had spent considerable money to provide paved roads. Under the circumstances, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

Espinola Jackson, a member of the Housing Committee of the Bayview-Hunters Point Model Neighborhood Agency, stated that residents of the subject neighborhood had lived with automobile wrecking yards too long already and did not wish to have to continue to live with them in the future. She stated that residents of the area want to have new houses and a nice neighborhood; and, already, people are paying as much as \$38,000 for homes in the area. She stated that when the guidelines for automobile wrecking yards had been adopted in April, 1969, residents of the subject neighborhood had not even known that the City Planning Commission existed; and, therefore, they had not had any opportunity to go on record in opposition to automobile wrecking yards at that time.

Earl Mills, Assistant Project Director for the India Basin Industrial Park Redevelopment Project Area, advised the Commission that relocation of the automobile wrecking yards is a matter of extreme urgency. He stated that the redevelopment project had been funded in May, 1969, for a period of 5 years; and, therefore, the project would have to be completed by May, 1974. Under the circumstances, the new developments to be constructed in the project area must be tightly scheduled; and the property now occupied by the automobile dismantlers must be acquired shortly after the first of next year. Mr. Mills remarked that soil conditions are quite poor on the property now occupied by the wrecking yards; and, since the property is scheduled to be used for heavy industry, an intensive soil improvement program will have to be undertaken which will involve at least one year to allow the soil to settle and become stabilized. The soil will have to be stabilized by the first part of 1972 so that the property can be used for relocation of the meat processing plants; and, following that relocation process, new developments will have to be created on those sites prior to May, 1974. He stated that the Redevelopment Agency had worked very hard to find new sites for the automobile dismantlers; yet, he felt that the whole city should bear responsibility for solving the problem.

8/6/70

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the relocation problem had come about as a result of a redevelopment project, asked if the Redevelopment Agency had any suggestion for alternate sites for automobile wrecking yards in case the subject application should be disapproved by the Commission. Mr. Mills replied that the only sites which had been found by the Redevelopment Agency are located in the South Bayshore area. He remarked that automobile dismantling can be a good industry, particularly if conditions are established and enforced by the City Planning Commission; and he hoped that the subject application would be approved.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if Mr. Mills felt that automobile dismantling would be a proper use for the subject property in terms of the program being developed by the Model Neighborhood Agency. Mr. Mills replied in the affirmative. While automobile dismantling does not provide a large number of jobs, it is a necessary industry; and he felt that automobile dismantling could be an attractive industrial neighbor which would not be detrimental to people living in the area.

The Director felt that it was clear that neither the Model Neighborhood Agency nor residents of the subject neighborhood wished to have automobile wrecking yards in their neighborhood; however, it was equally clear that the automobile wrecking yards must be removed from the Butchertown area at an early date if the Redevelopment Agency's Industrial Project is to move ahead. He hoped that the staff of the Department of City Planning could continue to be a positive force in trying to solve both problems; and, even though no one had yet recommended an alternate site for the automobile wrecking yards, the staff of the Department of City Planning would continue to try to find a solution to that problem. In view of the fact that Mr. Brooks had asked that the subject application be rejected and that the agencies involved should then cooperate in further study of the problem, he felt that it might be best for the Commission to postpone action on the subject application for the time being. He indicated, however, that he would like to read into the record the type of conditions which would be recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning if the subject application were to be approved. Those conditions were as follows:

"1. Said authorization is for no more than two dismantling operators on Assessor's Block 4794 and no more than three dismantling operators on Assessor's Block 4805. Assessor's Block 4805 would be developed in two phases: Phase I, the site would be developed for three auto dismantlers; Phase II, the site would be developed for use by one operator only.

"2. A fence or wall of solid material, 10 feet in height and of uniform appearance shall be installed around the wrecking yard perimeter with one gate 20 feet wide for each street frontage occupied by each of the five separate dismantling operators. The gates must be consistent in appearance with the fencing.

8/6/70

"3. Abutting dismantling operations shall be separated by an uninterrupted solid fence or wall acceptable to the Department of City Planning. No passage between abutting lots is permitted.

"4. Thomas Avenue shall be improved from Griffith Street to Fitch Street in a manner approved by the Bureau of Engineering for temporary street-paving. Said street improvements shall be continuously maintained by applicant.

"5. All customer ingress to and egress from the proposed wrecking yards on Block 4794 and in Phase I shall be on Thomas Avenue. In Phase II, customer ingress to and egress from the wrecking yard on Block 4805 may be on Griffith Street.

"6. Trucks conveying inoperable or dismantled vehicles shall be routed through industrial areas, and routing to and from dismantling or other storage yards shall be approved by the Department of City Planning.

"7. A building with lavatory facilities and with direct connection to sanitary sewer, shall be provided in general conformance with the plans (labelled Exhibit A, Exhibit B, and Exhibit C) submitted with this application and modified per Conditions 2, 3 and 7 of this Resolution and in conformance with Building Code standards and Health Department Minimum Industrial Facility requirements. The exterior finish must conform with other area development.

"8. The subject lot shall be graded and surfaced with a material approved by the Department of City Planning and in conformance with Building Code specifications in order to prevent dust, runoff water accumulation and the tracking of debris onto City rights-of-way. Running water and drainage, as required by the Bureau of Building Inspection, shall be provided.

"9. No stacking of wrecked or inoperable vehicles shall be permitted in the open yard, and all such vehicles shall be stored in uniform rows. Areas must be delineated for stripping and for the storing of combustible debris. Cutting and welding shall be done in areas designated for such use only. Fire extinguishers as required by the Fire Department shall be provided.

"10. No inoperable vehicles, partially or totally dismantled vehicles or vehicles being processed by any auto dismantling establishment may be parked on the street at any time.

"11. No debris shall be allowed to accumulate in excess of the capacity of containers approved by the Health, Building and Fire Departments, and a licensed refuse collection service shall be secured to haul such excess debris from the site.

1. The purpose of this document is to provide information regarding the activities of the [redacted] and the [redacted] in the [redacted] area.

2. It is noted that the [redacted] has been active in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

3. The [redacted] has been observed in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

4. It is noted that the [redacted] has been active in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

5. The [redacted] has been observed in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

6. It is noted that the [redacted] has been active in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

7. The [redacted] has been observed in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

8. It is noted that the [redacted] has been active in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

9. The [redacted] has been observed in the [redacted] area, and it is believed that the [redacted] is involved in the [redacted] activities.

"12. Final preliminary plans indicating all construction (fences, building, yard lighting, etc.) and detailed layouts of the auto storage configuration must be submitted to the Department of City Planning for review and approval prior to submitting any applications for building or use permits.

"13. Landscaping shall be installed as indicated on Exhibits A, B and C. All plantings shall be maintained in a healthy, attractive condition and replaced whenever necessary because of deformity, disease or other defect.

"14. No wrecked autos may be moved onto the subject lots and no aspect of the auto wrecking business may be effected on these lots until the Department of City Planning verifies that the applicants have fully complied with Conditions 1 through 12 above.

"15. One principal advertising sign for each of the dismantling operators will be permitted on the street frontage used for customer access. One additional attached sign no larger than 4 feet by 4 feet will be permitted on the secondary street frontage of each of these operations. Prior to installation plans for all signs shall be submitted to the Department of City Planning for review with respect to size, location and general appearance.

"16. Prior to the merging of the three lots on Assessor's Block 4805 into one dismantling operation, the applicant must submit for review to the Department of City Planning final preliminary plans for all construction on the site, plot layout and landscaping. Scheduling and phasing plans for discontinuing the three individual dismantling operations and establishing the one auto dismantling operation shall be submitted at the same time. Subsequent to approval by the Department of City Planning of the abovementioned final preliminary plans and the scheduling and phasing of the proposed alterations as being in conformity with the intent of this Resolution, no authorization to conduct auto dismantling operations on this property will be in effect unless and until the Department of City Planning shall verify that the applicant has satisfactorily completed all site alterations deemed necessary and appropriate by the Department of City Planning for conversion of the subject lot to one auto dismantling operation in conformity with the intent of this Resolution."

Mr. Axelrod stated that his clients might have difficulty in meeting some of the conditions which had been read by the Director of Planning; and, therefore, he concurred in the Director's recommendation that action on the application should be postponed indefinitely.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

The Board shall have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act. The Board shall also have the right to suspend or terminate the employment of any employee who is found to be in violation of the provisions of this Act.

8/6/70

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement indefinitely.

- ZM70.26 Homewood Terrace, Ocean Avenue, north line, 120 feet west of Faxon Avenue.
R-1-D to R-2 and C-2 Districts.
- CU70.77 Homewood Terrace, Ocean Avenue, north line, 120 feet west of Faxon Avenue.
Request for a planned unit development consisting of 300 to 335 dwelling units and 125,000 square feet of commercial floor area, in R-2 and C-2 Districts.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator) advised the Commission that the newspaper advertisement giving notice of the public hearing on the subject application had erroneously indicated that the applicant had requested reclassification to C-2 of a continuous strip along Ocean Avenue to a depth of 200 feet rather than 300 feet; and, as a result, the application would have to be re-advertised for hearing and action by the City Planning Commission on September 3. However, since a number of people were present in the audience from the subject neighborhood, he felt that it would be desirable to proceed with the hearing as scheduled without any action being taken by the Commission at the conclusion of the hearing. He then referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of a continuous strip along Ocean Avenue to a depth of 300 feet from R-1-D to C-2. The remainder of the site would be reclassified from R-1-D to R-2. If the Commission were willing to approve the requested zone changes, the applicant also hoped for approval of a conditional use application which would allow construction of a residential-commercial complex as a planned unit development. Approximately 300 to 335 dwelling units in multiple-family dwellings would be constructed. The planned apartment mix would be 46% as one-bed rooms, 43% as two-bedrooms and 11% as three bed rooms. 410 to 460 covered off-street parking spaces would be provided in the residential portion of the project. The commercial portion of the project would be developed with approximately 125,000 square feet of floor area occupied by a junior department store, a bank, dining facilities and othersimilar commercial enterprises. 420 off-street parking spaces would be provided for the commercial development. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the proposed project had been submitted by the applicant in the form of a Master Plan for development rather than in the form of detailed architectural plans.

William Coblentz, Attorney for the applicants, stated that he would be willing to accept a one-month's delay in action by the Commission; however, as is the case in most large projects, time is of the essence.

President Newman asked for a show of hands of those present in the audience in opposition to the application. Approximately nine people raised their hands.

8/6/70

Joseph Armin, 150 Southwood Drive, felt that his opposition to the subject application was singular in nature; and, if he were to be given an opportunity to state his concern at the present time, the applicants might be able to study the problem and to respond during the meeting of September 3.

Mike Mooney, representing the Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside Community Association, Inc. (OMI), advised the Commission that a number of people were in the audience who were not necessarily opposed to the application but who wished to raise questions concerning the proposal. He felt that it would be helpful if the applicants were allowed to make a presentation during the present hearing.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Commissioner Porter remarked that it is usually customary for the developers of large projects to meet with neighborhood groups to explain their proposals before bringing the matter before the City Planning Commission; and she wondered if the present applicants had made an attempt to explain their project to residents of the neighborhood. Mr. Coblenz replied that the applicants had met with neighborhood groups; however, he indicated that they would be glad to proceed with their presentation and to respond to questions from the audience during the course of the present meeting.

The owner of property located at 1936 Ocean Avenue stated that new development is badly needed in the subject neighborhood to bring activity to the area; and he felt that the proposed project should be allowed to proceed as soon as possible without delay.

Mr. Mooney stated that OMI had scheduled a town meeting for next Thursday evening; and he believed that it would be possible to invite the applicants to make a presentation of their project to residents of the neighborhood at that meeting.

Barry Wasserman, representing the firm of Wasserman-Herman Associates, architects for the applicants, stated that he had first endeavored to contact residents of the subject neighborhood in August, 1969, working through SPUR and the West of Twin Peaks Central Council. At that time, he had contacted a number of neighborhood associations, as well as the residents of Wildwood Way, and had held a meeting in his office on August 27, 1969, to discuss his client's proposals for use of the site. Twelve people had attended that meeting. Subsequently, he had sent ten copies of information to residents of the neighborhood. Following those initial contacts, financial problems had arisen and the project was deferred. When the project became active again, further contacts were made in the neighborhood and another meeting was held with the residents of the area. Comments which had been made by residents of the area were more favorable than he had anticipated; and, as a result, the plans for the project had not been subjected to a great number of changes. He indicated, however, that he would be willing to continue to work with any residents of the area who had not yet been contacted.

8/6/70

Mr. Wasserman referred to a model which was present in the meeting room to describe the proposed project. He stated that the size and number of dwelling units had been arrived at after a decision had been made regarding the overall bulk of the project; and he noted that priority had been given to the protection of existing residential buildings around the perimeter of the subject site by maintaining an average distance of 40 feet between the edge of the proposed project and the existing residential buildings. He stated that primary automobile access to both the commercial and residential portions would be from Ocean Avenue; however, minor automobile access to the commercial portion of the project would be provided on Elmwood Way for the convenience of residents of the area. Approximately 400 parking spaces would be provided for the residential units; and those parking spaces would be able to accommodate approximately 1.3 cars for each dwelling unit. The roof of the commercial portion of the project would be available for recreation. The height of one of the residential buildings would be on a level approximately halfway between the floor and ceiling of the living areas of homes located on Wildwood Way; however, all of the remaining residential buildings would be lower and would not impede views. The residential buildings would come within 25 feet of the property line at five points; the the commercial portion of the project would come within 25 feet of the property line at one point. He emphasized, however, that existing trees would be maintained along the property lines; and, in addition, new trees would be planted which were not shown on the model.

During the course of Mr. Wasserman's presentation, Commissioner Fleishhacker absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

President Newman asked if the commercial portion of the project would be in the form of a single type of store or in the form of a shopping center. Mr. Wasserman replied that the commercial development would have one major tenant (a junior department store), a grocery store, and a number of small shops; however, it would not be a shopping center as such. He stated that the intent of his clients was to create a strong enough retail anchor to encourage development of the adjacent commercial area.

President Newman wondered if Elmwood Way would have to carry a heavy volume of traffic if it were to be used for access to the commercial portion of the project area. Mr. Wasserman replied in the negative, indicating that the design of the project would encourage most people to use the automobile access from Ocean Avenue.

Nick Tsiplakos, owner of property located at 1930 Ocean Avenue, felt that the proposed project would attract business which other merchants in the area could share. The project would not block any views; and it would bring the City new taxes. Under the circumstances, he felt that it should be approved.

Edward Pearson, President of the Westwood Park Homeowners Association, stated that his organization has a membership of approximately 700 people. He stated that the members of his organization had been opposed to previous proposals for the site; and he indicated that they would be affected by the proposed project more than other residents of the area. He stated that his

8/6/70

organization had concluded that the present R-1-D zoning of the subject site is not appropriate; and they felt that the property should be developed and placed on the tax roles. They had no objection to the commercial uses proposed along Ocean Avenue; and they felt that the requested planned unit development authorization would be satisfactory providing that suitable conditions were established by the Commission. However, they felt that access to the commercial portion of the project via Elmwood Way might present problems; and, as a result, they wanted to be given positive assurance that the Elmwood Way entrance would not be connected with the residential garages and that it would not carry a heavy volume of traffic. In addition, they wished to have positive assurance that the proposed project would not grow in height or density and that the proposed setback lines would not be changed in the future. Under those circumstances, they would be willing to support the subject application.

Larry Hankins, President of the Ocean-Ingleside Merchants Association, stated that the members of his organization had been concerned about the possibility that the residential portion of the proposed project might be subsidized for welfare recipients; however, they had voted unanimously in favor of the project.

William McMichael, operator of the College Pharmacy and Secretary of the Merchants Association, stated that he had felt for a very long time that development of the Ocean Avenue frontage of the subject site with commercial uses would link together and improve the retail district along Ocean Avenue. Especially if the jobs in a new development were to offer different types of merchandise from that offered in other shops in the area, he believed that the project would be of great benefit.

Henry Hinds, a resident on Faxon Avenue and a Director of the Westwood Park Homeowners Association, stated that he had opposed a high-rise development which had previously been proposed for the subject site; and he was grateful that the City Planning Commission had disapproved that application. If assurance could be given that the proposed development would not come closer than 25 feet to adjacent properties, that the general average height of the project would be 40 feet and that the amount of parking being proposed would actually be constructed, he believed that most of the people living on Faxon Avenue would be in favor of the project. He did suggest, however, that the applicant should furnish parking spaces for employees of the project in addition to the parking spaces which had already been proposed.

Charles Meyers, 579 Wildwood Way, stated that he had spoken with the majority of the property owners on Wildwood Way and had found that most of them were willing to support the subject application.

Clair Fisher, representing the West of Twin Peaks Central Council, commended the applicants for the way in which they had made an effort to contact neighborhood organizations and residents at an early stage before plans for the project were finalized so that interested citizens could participate in the project and make their feelings known. While his organization had opposed the high-rise development previously proposed for the site, he had not heard of any objections to the present proposal.

8/6/70

Mrs. Walter Green, 874 Urbana Drive, stated that residents of the subject neighborhood had hoped for many years that the subject property could be retained as open space; however, she admitted that the possibility of obtaining funds for purchase of the property did not seem hopeful. She felt that the proposed project had been well designed, but she regretted that it would use the last available open space in an overcrowded neighborhood.

Joseph Armin, 150 Southwood Drive, stated that he had not received a notice of the scheduled hearing but had learned of the hearing from a notice posted on a telephone pole. He stated that most of the residents of the neighborhood had little knowledge of the proposed plans except by hearsay. He had reviewed the plans at the Department of City Planning, and he felt that the proposal was better than projects which had previously been suggested for the site. He stated that he had purchased his home because he wished to live in a quiet residential neighborhood. Yet, parking had already become a problem in the neighborhood; and he felt that a project as large as the one proposed would compound that problem, particularly if access were to be allowed onto the site via Elmwood Way. He stated that Elmwood Way is narrow; and when cars are parked on both sides of the street, there is only room for one lane of traffic. Furthermore, the garage of one of the houses in that area opens onto Elmwood Way. He stated that the lady who lives across the street from Elmwood Way had indicated that she did not want to have a major trafficway outside of her door. He felt that even if access via Elmwood Way were made difficult, people would find it and use it. Since he did not regard access via Elmwood Way to be essential for the proposed project, he felt that all traffic except emergency vehicles should be prohibited on the street and that it should be used for pedestrians only.

James Savoy, owner of Savoy Auto Parts located at 1540 Ocean Avenue, asked if the commercial portion of the proposed project would have an auto parts store. Mr. Coblenz replied that it would be impossible to provide a specific answer to that question at the present time.

Mr. Savoy stated that he regarded Ocean Avenue to be a well-developed area; and he felt that duplication of existing retail stores in the proposed project would hurt the merchants who presently own business on the street. Although some of the merchants on the street are older people who may not be greatly concerned about the problem, he was young and anxious not to have his business damaged.

Ernest H. Reinke, 777 Faxon Avenue, stated that he had been unalterably opposed to the high-rise project which had previously been proposed for the site. He was not entirely opposed to the plan under consideration; however, he felt that certain modifications should be made in the proposal. He agreed with the comments Mr. Armin had made regarding access to the project via Elmwood Way; and he felt that the street should be completely closed except for pedestrian traffic. He stated that Faxon Avenue already has traffic and parking problems; and he noted that the street has a six percent grade. The only park in the area is a small triangular parcel of land opposite Elmwood Way; and he wondered where the children who would live in the proposed project would play. He

[illegible]

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., and is being furnished to you for your information. It is to be understood that this information is being furnished to you for your information only and is not to be used for any other purpose.

8/6/70

questioned whether the proposed project would be a profit-making venture or a subsidized venture; and he was anxious to know what assurance could be given that the project would be constructed as shown on the model.

Mr. Mooney requested the Commission to inquire into the present state of service facilities in the subject neighborhood such as schools, Fire Department Services, Police protection, etc., and to determine whether plans have been made to improve and strengthen those services to accommodate the proposed project.

George Gotelli, 635 Faxon Avenue, asked if any plans had been made for the vacant lot on the corner of Ocean and Faxon Avenues. Mr. Wasserman replied that the property is for sale; however, he indicated that it was not included in the proposed project.

President Newman stated that the subject application would be re-advertized and that another hearing would be held for consideration of the application at the Commission's meeting on September 3, 1970.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

1. The following information is to be shown for any business unit which is a subsidiary of the company:

1960-1961, and 1962-1963. The following table shows the results of the survey for the years 1960-1961 and 1962-1963. The survey was conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the results are presented in the following table.

...the
... ..
... ..

and of these conditions, together with your family name, if desired, may be furnished to you by post. Please forward a return card by mail to the following address:

1944-1945

1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 2680, 26

(continued)

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY AND MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 13, 1970
100 LARKIN STREET
2:15 P.M.

PRESENT: Commissioner Boreman, Finn, Fleishhacker, Porter.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the meetings of July 2, July 9, and July 30, 1970 APPROVED
as SUBMITTED. Vote: 4-0.

1. CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, introduced Gilbert Boreman, Management Analyst in the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, who had been designated to serve as Mr. Mellon's alternate on the Commission for today's meeting.

2. Presentation of Urban Design Study Preliminary Report No. 5 -- Urban Design Principles for San Francisco..

Thomas R. Aidala, A.I.A., presented the report and responded to questions raised by members of the Commission. The report is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

ADJOURNED: 3:35 P.M.

THE BOARD OF
CITY ENGINEERS
STANDARD AND DESIGN OF THE BOARD OF
ENGINEERS
100 NORTH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL.

REPORT: Standard Board, Final Report, 1907.

REPORT OF THE

BOARD OF ENGINEERS
STANDARD AND DESIGN OF THE BOARD OF
ENGINEERS

CHICAGO, ILL.

1907

REPORT OF THE
BOARD OF ENGINEERS
STANDARD AND DESIGN OF THE BOARD OF
ENGINEERS

CHICAGO, ILL.

REPORT OF THE
BOARD OF ENGINEERS
STANDARD AND DESIGN OF THE BOARD OF
ENGINEERS

CHICAGO, ILL.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 20, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 20, 1970, at 1:00 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Richard Gamble, Planner IV; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Bill Workman represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 P.M. to take a field trip to property scheduled for consideration during the zoning hearing of September 3, 1970.

2:45 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of July 16 & 23 and August 13, 1970, be approved as submitted. The Commission deferred action on the minutes of the meeting of July 8, 1970.

CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, reported that a suit had been filed against the City Planning Commission, the Director of Planning, and the Zoning Administrator seeking a writ of mandate to require approval of applications for the care of up to 6 mentally retarded children in homes in R-1 and R-1-D districts instead of the maximum of 2 children presently permitted by the Zoning Administrator's interpretation of the City Planning Code. He indicated that the City Attorney will represent the Commission in the Courts. R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), summarized the arguments which had been stated in the summons.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Washington, D.C. 20535

TO: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FROM: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RE: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DATE: [REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED]
6. [REDACTED]

7. [REDACTED]

8. [REDACTED]
9. [REDACTED]
10. [REDACTED]

11. [REDACTED]

12. [REDACTED]

13. [REDACTED]
14. [REDACTED]
15. [REDACTED]

16. [REDACTED]

17. [REDACTED]
18. [REDACTED]
19. [REDACTED]
20. [REDACTED]
21. [REDACTED]
22. [REDACTED]
23. [REDACTED]
24. [REDACTED]
25. [REDACTED]
26. [REDACTED]
27. [REDACTED]
28. [REDACTED]
29. [REDACTED]
30. [REDACTED]
31. [REDACTED]
32. [REDACTED]
33. [REDACTED]
34. [REDACTED]
35. [REDACTED]
36. [REDACTED]
37. [REDACTED]
38. [REDACTED]
39. [REDACTED]
40. [REDACTED]
41. [REDACTED]
42. [REDACTED]
43. [REDACTED]
44. [REDACTED]
45. [REDACTED]
46. [REDACTED]
47. [REDACTED]
48. [REDACTED]
49. [REDACTED]
50. [REDACTED]
51. [REDACTED]
52. [REDACTED]
53. [REDACTED]
54. [REDACTED]
55. [REDACTED]
56. [REDACTED]
57. [REDACTED]
58. [REDACTED]
59. [REDACTED]
60. [REDACTED]
61. [REDACTED]
62. [REDACTED]
63. [REDACTED]
64. [REDACTED]
65. [REDACTED]
66. [REDACTED]
67. [REDACTED]
68. [REDACTED]
69. [REDACTED]
70. [REDACTED]
71. [REDACTED]
72. [REDACTED]
73. [REDACTED]
74. [REDACTED]
75. [REDACTED]
76. [REDACTED]
77. [REDACTED]
78. [REDACTED]
79. [REDACTED]
80. [REDACTED]
81. [REDACTED]
82. [REDACTED]
83. [REDACTED]
84. [REDACTED]
85. [REDACTED]
86. [REDACTED]
87. [REDACTED]
88. [REDACTED]
89. [REDACTED]
90. [REDACTED]
91. [REDACTED]
92. [REDACTED]
93. [REDACTED]
94. [REDACTED]
95. [REDACTED]
96. [REDACTED]
97. [REDACTED]
98. [REDACTED]
99. [REDACTED]
100. [REDACTED]

8/20/70

Mr. Steele also reported on actions which had been taken by the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on Tuesday.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Finn arrived in the meeting and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Dorothy Shinder, 1692-A Green Street, complained about the number of curb-side parking spaces which have been removed in her neighborhood because of new red zones or because of construction of new buildings. President Newman asked the staff to discuss the matter with Miss Shinder and to advise the Commission of any action that would be appropriate.

R70.44 - Winfield Street, between Cortland and Esmeralda Avenues
change in official sidewalk widths from 10 to 6 feet.

Richard Gamble, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Director of Public Works.

"The section of Winfield Street proposed for widening is within the Bernal Heights Conservation Area on the western slope of the hill, for which an application for federal funds has been made under the Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Program. Like most north-south streets in Bernal Heights, Winfield Street has a right-of-way width of 40 feet. The proposal is to widen the present 20-foot roadway to 28 feet by narrowing the sidewalks from 10 to 6 feet, to permit two parking lanes and one traffic lane. As it is now, cars must park on the sidewalks in order to leave a clear traffic lane. It will probably be designated as a one-way street after it is widened.

"Both Eugenia Avenue and Esmeralda Avenue are now unimproved on the western, downhill side of Winfield Street but will be improved with stairways if the expected federal funding is received. It is proposed to include, as a part of the Winfield sidewalk narrowing work, the widening of the sidewalks to 14 feet on the west side of the street at Eugenia and Esmeralda Avenues as extensions of plaza areas at the head of the proposed stairways, preventing cars from parking at the intersections and creating space wide enough for tree planting in the Winfield right-of-way.

8/20/70

"Legislation has already been passed providing for undergrounding of utilities on certain of the streets within the FACE area, not including Winfield Street. However, every effort should be made to secure undergrounding on Winfield Street in conjunction with the sidewalk narrowing.

"The West Bernal Heights FACE Advisory Committee has recommended that the brick roadbed of Winfield Street be restored where it has been disturbed for utilities repair. The Committee has also recommended undergrounding of utilities in conjunction with the street widening, and the widening of the sidewalks at Eugenia and Esmeralda Avenues."

Commissioner Mellon asked if the West Bernal Heights FACE Advisory Committee expected that new bricks will be installed in the widened portions of Winfield Street. Mr. Gamble replied in the negative, indicating that the Committee had requested only that the existing bricks be restored where they have been disturbed for utilities repairs; and he felt that widening of that portion of the street with a concrete apron would be acceptable to the Committee.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Federal Government will provide funds for the proposed street widening through the FACE program. Mr. Gamble replied that that street widening project had already been funded from gas tax funds.

Lewis Lindsay, a member of San Francisco Tomorrow, felt that the narrowing of the sidewalks from 10 feet to 6 feet along a 1,000-foot portion of Winfield Street would be undesirable since it would provide additional accommodation for automobiles at the expense of pedestrians.

Jeanette Sonnesyn, Chairman of the West Bernal Heights FACE Advisory Committee, stated that the Committee had spent a great deal of time discussing the proposed street widening project; and they had concluded that something must be done to accommodate automobiles which are already in the neighborhood. She thought that the proposed street widening would be an improvement; however, she hoped that the street would be widened at intersections to provide safe areas in which children might play, that wires could be undergrounded in conjunction with the street widening project, and that the existing brick portion of the street could be restored.

Joseph Maloney, a resident of the subject neighborhood, felt that the play areas proposed to be constructed at street intersections would be a particularly attractive feature of the proposed project.

8/20/70

Commissioner Porter, noting that the city has a priority program for undergrounding utility wires on specific streets, wondered if it would be possible to include the undergrounding of utility wires on the subject portion of Winfield Street in that program. Mr. Gamble replied that the undergrounding of utility wires on Winfield Street had previously been included in the City's projected program; however, in order to coordinate the undergrounding of wires with the proposed street widening project, the undergrounding had been delayed. He hoped that the undergrounding project could be restored to the City's program before the termination of the FACE program since that program would provide abutting property owners with low interest loans to cover the cost of the undergrounding. In addition, the City's share of the cost of undergrounding could be considered as a credit towards the City's share of the cost for the FACE program. In conclusion, he indicated that he was confident that the proposal for undergrounding the wires on Winfield Street would be supported by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Murphy recommended that the proposed change in official sidewalk widths be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan providing that undergrounding of utilities along the street be scheduled simultaneously with the street widening work, providing that the west sidewalk is widened to 14 feet at Eugenia and Esmeralda Avenues, and providing that the brick portion of the street be restored.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the change in official sidewalk widths from 10 to 6 feet on Winfield Street between Cortland and Esmeralda Avenues is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that undergrounding of utilities along the street is scheduled simultaneously with the street widening work, providing that the west sidewalk is widened to 14 feet at Eugenia and Esmeralda Avenues, and providing that the brick portion of the street is restored.

R70.56 - Vacation of a portion of Donner Avenue east of Third Street.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Director of Public Works.

"Donner Avenue is a fee street in the South Bayshore's South Basin industrial area. It now dead ends a little more than 200 feet east of Third Street, where it was closed in 1930 between Keith and Jennings Streets. Keith Street was closed to the north of Donner in 1942 and to the south in 1964.

8/20/70

"United States Cold Storage of California is requesting the vacation of an 80-foot wide, 64-foot deep portion of Donner Avenue at the dead end adjacent to its property for the expansion of its facilities, with possible construction of loading docks in the future. The only other owner abutting on Donner Avenue will retain his access since the street will not be vacated along his frontage. The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation has reviewed the proposed vacation and has no objection.

"The area is in the M-1 zoning district."

Percy McKelvey, representing the United States Cold Storage Company of California, stated that he was hopeful that the proposed vacation of a portion of Donner Avenue would be approved.

Mrs. Andrew Gallagher, representing the Southern Promotion Association, emphasized that the proposed street vacation would not inconvenience other property owners in the area; and, since the abutting property owners had been responsible for maintaining the street during the rainy season, she felt that the proposed street vacation would be desirable.

Mr. Murphy recommended that the proposed street vacation be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the vacation of a portion of Donner Avenue east of Third Street, as shown on SUR-2470, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

...the ... of ...

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, August 27, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 27, 1970, at 2:15 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas G. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Fritz Mock, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of June 18, 1970 be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, reported on various actions taken by the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on Monday. He also advised the Commission that two special meetings have been scheduled for Public Hearings on the Improvement Plan for Residence -- September 14 at 7:30 P.M. at Balboa High School and September 28 at 7:30 P.M. at Frank McCoppin Elementary School.

Dorothy Shinder, 1692-A Green Street, complained that two new apartment buildings in her neighborhood had been constructed with less than the required number of parking spaces; and, since the buildings had also removed curbside parking spaces which had existed previously, she asked that she be provided with a free parking space in one of the new apartment buildings.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Miller arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

R70.46 - Vacation of Fairfax Avenue between Quint and Phelps Streets.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Director of Public Works.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, MAY 15, 1954

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO has received from the National Science Foundation a grant for the study of the structure and properties of the liquid state.

It is the policy of the University to support research in the physical sciences and engineering, and to provide for the education of students in these fields. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

The study of the liquid state is a field of research which has attracted the attention of many scientists. The University is pleased to support this research, and to provide for the education of students in this field. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

Very truly yours,
The Dean

Enclosure

It is the policy of the University to support research in the physical sciences and engineering, and to provide for the education of students in these fields. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

Very truly yours,
The Dean

The study of the liquid state is a field of research which has attracted the attention of many scientists. The University is pleased to support this research, and to provide for the education of students in this field. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

The study of the liquid state is a field of research which has attracted the attention of many scientists. The University is pleased to support this research, and to provide for the education of students in this field. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

Very truly yours,
The Dean

Enclosure

Very truly yours,
The Dean

The study of the liquid state is a field of research which has attracted the attention of many scientists. The University is pleased to support this research, and to provide for the education of students in this field. The University is committed to the highest standards of scholarship and to the advancement of knowledge.

August 27, 1970

"West of Third Street, Fairfax Avenue in the Islais Creek industrial district is improved only in one short block. Its vacation between Quint and Phelps Streets has been requested by the Golden Gate Disposal Company, owner of the block fronting it on the north, which intends to relocate its office and truck parking yard here from the present site at Mason and North Point Streets in the North Waterfront area.

"The Southern Pacific Company and the Santa Fe Land Improvement Company, each with an undivided half interest, are the abutting owners of the vacant block to the south. They have generally agreed to the vacation and will receive the southerly half of the street.

"It has not yet been determined whether Fairfax Avenue is a fee or easement street. The area proposed for vacation is 80 feet wide and 600 feet long and is in the M-2 zoning district.

"Evans Avenue, one block north, is the major east-west street serving the area. Phelps Street, the north-south street to the east, is improved, but Quint Street to the west is not. The adopted South Bayshore Plan shows all streets closed in this tier of blocks between Evans and Jerrold Avenues. The streets within the Southeast Sewage Plant have already been closed.

"The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation has reviewed the proposed vacation and found no objection to it."

Mr. Murphy recommended that the proposed street vacation be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After the discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the vacation of Fairfax Avenue between Quint and Phelps Streets, as shown on SUR-2270, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R70.50 - Lot 13, Block 7172, at Santa Barbara Avenue and Head Street. Surplus property inquiry.

Mr. Jung reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Director of Public Works.

"Irregularly shaped Lot 13, Block 7172, consists of approximately 7425 square feet on a knoll overlooking the Southern Freeway, Alemany Boulevard and Brotherhood Way. The property was acquired by the City for the extension of Santa Barbara Avenue, a street originating in Daly City and deadening some 400 feet north of the country line in San Francisco, so as to connect it with Head Street in San Francisco.

From the second file in the above mentioned group, the following information was obtained:

...the author of the report...

It is not yet too late to prevent the British Empire from becoming a mere collection of islands. The only way to do this is to make the Empire a part of the world.

...the
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 08-11-2010 BY 60322 UCBAW

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United Kingdom regarding the proposed changes to the law of the United Kingdom regarding the treatment of the British Commonwealth countries.

August 27, 1970

"Head Street was paved for 80 feet of the 129-foot frontage on the easterly side of Lot 13 at a 27.5 per cent grade. The street extension work and the improvement of Head Street were completed in 1968 and the Department of Public Works wishes to dispose of the property.

"The property is in the R-1 zoning district. It has a pleasant view across the valley to Merced Heights, and is less than a third of a mile from the Daly City terminal of the BARTD system. The property is large enough to accommodate three lots; two of them could be corner lots since a new corner has been created by the extension of Santa Barbara Avenue to Head Street.

"There appears to be no public use for the property; it is a rather steep hillside for mini-park purposes."

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the subject property would be sold at auction to the highest bidder if it were to be declared surplus. Mr. Jung replied in the affirmative.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Murphy recommended that the sale of the subject portion of property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the sale of Lot 13, Block 7172, at Santa Barbara Avenue and Head Street is in conformity with the Master Plan.

RL18.70.3 - Tentative Subdivision Map for Previously Authorized Planned Unit Development at Lake Merced Wye.

Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 118 of the Charter, the subject referral concerning the subdivision of land has been received from the Director of Public Works for review and recommendations by the City Planning Commission.

"The proposal by Henry Doelger Builder, Inc. is to subdivide Lot 8 in Assessor's Block 7380, an R-1-D zoned parcel of land having an area of approximately one acre just north of the County line at the Lake Merced Wye, into nine lots, each to be occupied by a single-family dwelling grouped around a common open space. The individual lots would range in area from approximately 2850 square feet to 4,000 square feet. The central common open space would be approximately 8,800 square feet in area.

August 27, 1970

"The proposed subdivision is in general conformity with the plan authorized as a planned unit development by the Planning Commission in 1962 under Resolution No. 5593. The planned unit development authorization exempted the development from the side yard requirements and minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet otherwise applicable in an R-1-D district.

"Final plans for the houses have not been filed, but preliminary plans propose two-floor, three four-bedroom dwellings with two-car garages located on the first floor. Final landscaping plans have been filed showing the proposed treatment of open spaces on the individual lots, the common open space, and on adjacent City-owned property. The landscaping of the City-owned land, principally a 50-foot strip which separates the subject parcel from Lake Merced Blvd. under the jurisdiction of the Water Department, has been approved by the Water Department and the Recreation and Park Department, who also have an interest in this strip of land. In addition to the landscaping, the developer has also agreed to provide a parking lot on El Portal Way abutting the east side of the subdivision for visitors to the Broderick-Terry dual site, a short distance away on San Francisco Golf and County Club property in San Mateo County.

"Procedures for continued maintenance of open space and giving due notice on the land records in the County Recorder's office of the terms of the planned unit development are currently being reviewed by the Department and the developer."

Commissioner Porter, noting that a number of years had elapsed since the Planning Commission had first authorized the proposed development, asked if the applicants would definitely proceed to construct the development. Eugene Gray, representing the applicant, replied in the affirmative and indicated that a great deal of time had been required to resolve certain problems with various public and private agencies.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Murphy recommended that the tentative subdivision map be approved subject to the conditions which had been established for the proposed development by the City Planning Commission in 1962.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the Acting Director be authorized to report that the tentative map for the subdivision of Lot 8 in Assessor's Block 7380 prepared by Theodore Tronoff and dated June 18, 1970, with revisions dated July 13, 1970, and July 26, 1970, be approved subject to the conditions for the development of the subdivision as a planned unit development approved under City Planning Commission Resolution No. 5593.

August 27, 1970

Review of proposed final plans for dwellings in Planned Unit Development authorized for west side of Mount Sutro.

Mr. Murphy advised the Commission that the applicant has requested that the scheduled planned review be postponed until the Commission meeting on September 10, 1970.

At 2:45 P.M. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed.

The members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 P.M. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda. Commissioner Miller was absent from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

Report and Public Hearing on applications which have been filed requesting authorization to extend termination date of non-conforming uses from May 2, 1970 to May 2, 1980.

President Newman noted that the Commission had authorized and directed the Zoning Administrator to conduct preliminary hearings on the 34 cases for which applications had been filed for extension of non-conforming use termination dates from May 2, 1970 to May 2, 1980. He indicated that the preliminary hearings had been held by the Zoning Administrator who has now prepared a report to the Commission as to the proceedings and to give the Commission the Director's recommendation on each case.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that he had held a series of preliminary hearings to consider the various applications which had been filed; following the preliminary hearings each case was continued until the present hearing. During the interim, the staff of Department of City Planning had contacted each of the applicants to advise them of the nature of the staff recommendation; and case reports and minutes of the previous meeting had been distributed to members of the City Planning Commission for their background information. Draft resolutions had been placed before the members of the Commission for each of the 34 applications under consideration; and Mr. Steele indicated that disapproval was being recommended in only three cases.

Mr. Steele stated that the original termination dates for non-conforming uses has been based on the assessed value of the improvements existing in 1960. If the assessed value of the improvements at that time was less than \$500, the non-conforming uses were scheduled to terminate in 1965; however, that termination date was later extended to 1970. If the assessed valuation of improvements was greater than \$500 in 1960, the uses were given a termination date of May 2, 1980. Since the \$500 criterion was considered somewhat arbitrary in that it resulted in different termination dates for similar uses similarly

1. The first of the three main points of the report is that the Government has failed to provide adequate housing for the people of the country.

2. The second point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate employment opportunities for the people of the country.

3. The third point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate social services for the people of the country.

4. The fourth point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate education for the people of the country.

5. The fifth point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate health services for the people of the country.

6. The sixth point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate transport services for the people of the country.

7. The seventh point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate housing for the people of the country.

8. The eighth point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate employment opportunities for the people of the country.

9. The ninth point is that the Government has failed to provide adequate social services for the people of the country.

August 27, 1970

located, a decision had been made to accept applications requesting a ten year extension for non-conforming uses which were scheduled to be terminated in 1970. In order to be eligible for consideration for an extension, the non-conforming uses were required to be oriented towards neighborhood services; and, in cases where the staff was recommending that the applications be approved, certain conditions were being proposed. The type of conditions generally being recommended were as follows:

1. A requirement that the extension would expire on May 2, 1980.
2. A limit on the permitted hours of operation.
3. A requirement for removal of certain signs.
4. A requirement that the exterior of the building should be maintained in an attractive condition for the duration of the conditional use authorization.
5. A statement advising that the property would continue to be regulated by the provisions relating to non-conforming uses in Article I of the City Planning Code, except section 153(b) insofar as that section prescribes a 1970 expiration date.
6. In some cases, a condition to the effect that the conditional use authorization would be valid for only a specific use.

CU70.4 - 299 Peru Avenue; Lot 4 in Block 5950; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension of the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which had been prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6581.

CU70.6 - 168 Richland Avenue; Lot 1 in Block 5746; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject non-conforming use, a laundry and cleaning establishment, be granted the requested extension subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration for the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6582.

August 27, 1970

CU70.9 - 2601 Sutter Street; Lot 1 in Block 1974; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension for the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the applicant had indicated that he would be willing to conform to condition No. 4 of the draft resolution which would require the removal of a number of signs on the property within 60 days. Mr. Steele replied that the applicant had been advised of the conditions which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and he had not indicated any objections to the conditions.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6583.

CU70.10 - 80 Regent Street; Lot 18 in Block 7146; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension date for the subject non-conforming use, a laundry and cleaning establishment, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6584.

CU70.12 - 1451 Sanchez Street; Lot 28 in Block 6601; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension for the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration for the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

[illegible]

August 27, 1970

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6585.

CU70.13 - 1309 - 20th Street; Lot 1-A in Block 4102; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension of the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6586.

CU70.15 - 463 - 7th Avenue; Lot 13 in Block 1537; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension of the subject non-conforming use, a laundry, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6587.

CU70.18 - 130 Pope Street; Lot 4 in Block 6466; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension for the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6588.

CU70.23 - 1905 Clement Street; Lot 44 in Block 1452; in an R-3 Zoning District.

August 27, 1970

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension for the subject non-conforming use, a beauty salon and shoe repair shop, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 5689.

CU70.25 - 425 - 14th Street; Lot 30 in Block 3456; in an R-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the requested extension for the subject non-conforming use, the San Francisco Art Center, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6590.

CU70.27 - 2838 Clement Street; Lot 27-B in Block 1404; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application requesting an extension for the termination date for the subject non-conforming use, an income tax and insurance office, be disapproved. He stated that no other commercial uses exist on either side of the street in the subject block; and he indicated that the subject building had been vacant periodically over the past ten years and that few of the uses which had been made of the building had been oriented towards neighborhood service. No evidence had been submitted to establish that an income tax and insurance office at the subject location is needed to serve the frequent and recurring needs of residents of the area. While such a business might provide a neighborhood service in the spring when income taxes are due, it did not seem to him that the use would be important to the neighborhood during the remainder of the year. Mr. Steele also noted that a two-story, four unit, apartment building covers 80% of the subject lot with no rear yard available; and, if the building housing the non-conforming use were to be demolished after termination of the use, a rear yard could be provided for the apartment building which would conform to the standards of the City Planning Code.

Commissioner Porter asked if the property occupied by the building housing the non-conforming use could be used as a garage. Mr. Steele replied that the property could be used for a garage only if the Code requirement for useable open space for the apartment building were satisfied; and, given the small size of the lot, he felt that it would not be possible to provide both the required amount of open space and a garage.

August 27, 1970

Richard Holl, real estate agent for the applicant, stated that he disagreed with the opinion taken by Mr. Steele to the effect that the present use of the property does not provide a neighborhood service. He indicated that the income tax service is a convenience to residents of the neighborhood for at least four months of each year; and the insurance function provides service for residents of the area throughout the year.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the present occupants of the building hold a lease. Mr. Holl replied in the negative, indicating that the tenants pay on a month to month basis.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not regard the insurance and income tax office to be in the category of a neighborhood service since people might come from other parts of town to patronize the office. He then asked if disapproval of the subject application would require removal of the existing building. Mr. Steele replied in the negative; however, even if the permitted residential density of the site had not already been exceeded, he believed that it would be difficult to convert the subject building into a residential use.

Commissioner Ritchie asked how the subject property might be used if the existing building were to be demolished. Mr. Steele replied that the most desirable use of the property would be as open space for the existing apartment house in accordance with the requirements of the City Planning Code.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the subject application be disapproved. The motion failed for want of a second.

Mr. Steele, assuming that the Commission wished to approve the subject application, recommended that the approval be made subject to specific conditions which would establish a termination date of May 2, 1980, for the non-conforming use, which would provide that the building should be used only for an insurance or an income tax office, that the hours of operation of the use should be limited to the hours between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., that the exterior of the building should be maintained in an attractive manner, and that the property should continue to be regulated by the provisions relating to non-conforming uses in Articles I and VI of the City Planning Code.

Commissioner Ritchie questioned whether it would be desirable for the Commission to restrict the subject property to a single use. Mr. Steele remarked that similar conditions were contained in most of the draft resolutions which had been prepared for the approval of the other applications under consideration.

Commissioner Porter agreed with Commissioner Ritchie that it would not be desirable to limit the property to a specific use; and she suggested that the resolution should allow the Commission to determine whether any other uses which might be proposed for the site would be appropriate.

August 27, 1970

Mr. Steele remarked that the draft resolutions which had been prepared for approval of the other applications had specified that such decisions would be made by the Zoning Administrator in cases where properties were not being restricted to a single use.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that any proposals for other uses of the subject site should be considered by the Commission.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Ritchie that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele with a modification providing that any proposal for other uses of the property should be brought before the Commission for consideration rather than to the Zoning Administrator.

President Newman asked if the conditions being proposed were acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Holl replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Steele advised the applicant that a new conditional use application would have to be filed, involving a \$50 fee, if a proposal were to be made to change the use of the site in the future.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6591 and to approve Application CU70.27 subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele, as modified.

CU70.32 - 2103 Scott Street; Lot 9 in block 1003; in an R-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended disapproval of the subject application which requested extension of a non-conforming antique storage use of the property. He stated that the building had been used as an employment agency in 1963; and, after a subsequent vacancy, was being used as an antique shop in 1966. In May of 1970 the building was vacant; however, at the present time, the property was being used for storage of antiques. He remarked that no showing had been made that the use of the property as an antique shop would provide a necessary service for the neighborhood; and, since the termination date for the subject non-conforming use had already been extended from 1965 to 1970, he felt that a reasonable period of time had been granted for amortization of the non-conforming commercial use.

Sam Manley, owner of the subject property, stated that he did not know what use could be made of the property if the application or extension of the non-conforming use were to be disapproved. He stated that he had received an income of \$45 a month from the building when it was occupied; however, the building was now vacant.

The Board meeting will be held on January 11, 1947, at 10:00 A.M. in the Board Room, 1000 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. The Board will consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1946 and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1946 will report on the financial statement of the company for the year 1946, and on the operations of the company for the year 1946.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will report on the financial statement of the company for the year 1947, and on the operations of the company for the year 1947. The Board will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

The Board of Directors for the year 1947 will also consider the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947, and the report of the Board of Directors for the year 1947.

August 27, 1970

Commissioner Newman asked if the building could be used as a garage. Mr. Steele stated that it appeared to him that the building had originally been built as a garage.

Mr. Manley stated that the building had always been used as a shop and never as a garage.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how long the applicant had owned the subject property. Mr. Manley replied that he had owned both the subject property and the adjacent corner lot for approximately 18 or 20 years.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the subject parcel of property is a separate lot or if it is merely a portion of the corner lot. Mr. Manley replied that the property is a separate lot which contains three dwelling units and a garage in back of the commercial building.

At this point of the proceedings, Commissioner Finn absented himself from the meeting room.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the Commission, in considering requests for extension of non-conforming uses, was obligated by the City Planning Code to consider whether public need for the use had been demonstrated. Mr. Steele added that the Commission should also consider the vitality of the use in question.

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received in opposition from D. C. Lundy, President of the Alta Plaza Improvement Association, from Mrs. J. Brenden Brady, 2110 Scott Street, and from Jacqueline W. Woods, 2121 Scott Street.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the subject application.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Newman that the subject application be disapproved. When the question was called, Commissioners Fleishhacker and Newman voted "Aye" and Commissioners Porter and Ritchie voted "No". Therefore, in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the City Planning Commission, which provide that "A tie vote on any matter for the City Planning Commission shall be deemed to be a disapproval thereof", the subject application was disapproved.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Finn returned to the meeting room and re-assumed his seat at the Commission table.

August 27, 1970

Mrs. Manley asked if it would be possible to use the subject property for expansion of the laundrymat which occupies the corner lot. Mr. Steele replied that such a use of the property might have been possible; however, a separate conditional use application would have been required in order to enable the Commission to consider such a proposal.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried three to two that the Commission's disapproval of the subject application by tie vote be reconsidered. Commissioners Finn, Porter, and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioners Fleishhacker and Newman voted "No".

Mr. Steele summarized the discussion which had taken place while Commissioner Finn was out of the meeting room.

Commissioner Finn asked if the building could be used as a garage if the request for extension of the non-conforming use were disapproved. Mr. Steele replied that it appeared to him that such a use of the building would be structurally feasible.

Commissioner Finn asked what alternative use might be made of the site if the application were disapproved. Mr. Steele replied that it would be up to the owner to decide whether the building should be used as a garage, whether it should be left vacant, or whether it should be demolished.

Mr. Manley stated that the building is not large enough to be used for a garage.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Newman that the subject application be disapproved. When the question was called, Commissioners Fleishhacker and Newman voted "Aye", and Commissioners Finn, Porter and Ritchie voted "No." The motion therefore failed to receive a majority vote.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Steele if the use of the subject site should be limited to specific commercial activities if the subject application were to be approved. Mr. Steele suggested that the best approach might be for the Commission to take the matter under advisement until such time as the owner of the property has a prospective tenant; then, at that time, the Commission could consider the appropriateness of the use being proposed.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that further consideration of the subject application be taken under advisement indefinitely.

August 27, 1970

CU70.33 - 3605 Mission Street; Lot 28 in Block 5713; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a real estate and insurance office, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6592.

CU70.34 - 2824 - 23rd Street; Lot 17 in Block 4151; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a bar and cafe, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6593.

CU70.35 - 168 - 29th Street; Lot 17 in Block 6617; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a laundry and cleaning establishment, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6594.

August 27, 1970

CU70.36 - 400 Grafton Avenue; Lot 17 in Block 6983; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6595.

CU70.40 - 1496 Silver Avenue; Lot 1 in Block 5923; in an R-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a barber shop, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6596.

CU70.41 - 3101 San Jose Avenue; Lot 1 in Block 7161; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a chiropractor's office, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6597.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY

CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents. Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1910, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 102,363. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Postmaster: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1910, by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this journal in whole or in part without permission is prohibited. Printed and Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1910, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 102,363. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Postmaster: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1910, by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this journal in whole or in part without permission is prohibited. Printed and Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1910, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 102,363. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Postmaster: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1910, by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. All rights reserved. Reproduction of this journal in whole or in part without permission is prohibited. Printed and Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

August 27, 1970

CU70.44 - 847 Fillmore Street; Lot 2 in Block 798; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a barber shop and locksmith shop, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6597.

CU70.51 - 3137 Laguna Street; Lot 38 in Block 507; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a cafe, be approved subject to six specific conditions contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the application.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6599.

CU70.52 - 2479 Sutter Street; Lot 22 in Block 1076; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6600.

...the

...

... ..

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the motion.

Resolution of the Council.

After discussion, it was decided to

... ..

...

... ..

... ..

...

... ..

... ..

...

... ..

... ..

...

... ..

August 27, 1970

CU70.53 - 75 Sanchez Street; Lot 37 in Block 3537; in an R-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming use, a beauty shop, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6601.

CU70.54 - 649 Diamond Street; Lot 22 in Block 2804; in an R-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6602.

CU70.55 - 305 Persia Avenue; Lot 25 in Block 6080; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming use, a vacant building, be disapproved. He stated that the building had been used as a shoe repair shop from 1960 to 1966. Subsequently, the building had remained vacant except for a brief period in late 1969 when it was illegally in use as a building contractor's storage space. He stated that the owner of the property had claimed that he had paid more for the property than it was worth; and he had indicated that he hoped to install a dry cleaning and laundry establishment in the building in the future. Mr. Steele remarked that there are no other non-conforming commercial uses in the immediate vicinity of the subject site; however, two non-conforming laundry and dry cleaning establishments are located within 200 yards of the property. Since the applicant had not demonstrated a need for a laundry and cleaning use at the subject location, Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY

CHICAGO, ILL.

Subscription price, Five Dollars Per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents. Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1911, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 100,000. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized Second-Class Mail Matter.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, Five Dollars Per Annum in Advance.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1911, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 100,000. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized Second-Class Mail Matter.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association. All rights reserved. Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, Five Dollars Per Annum in Advance.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1911, Post Office at Chicago, Ill., under No. 100,000. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized Second-Class Mail Matter.

August 27, 1970

Joe Bradshaw, owner of the subject property, stated that he had not been aware of the residential zoning of the site when he had purchased the property; and, if the subject application were to be disapproved, he did not know what use could be made of the property. Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the seller of the property had not advised Mr. Bradshaw that the property was zoned for single family residential use. Mr. Bradshaw replied that he had not met the previous owner of the property; however, it had been obvious to him that the previous owner had been anxious to sell the property quickly. Mr. Bradshaw advised the commission that he had hired an architect to look at his building to determine whether it could be converted for residential use; and the architect had recommended against such conversion.

Mr. Grant, architect for the applicant, confirmed that conversion of the building for residential use would not be economically feasible.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the applicant had indicated that he wished to use the property for a laundry and dry cleaning establishment, asked Mr. Bradshaw if he had a specific tenant in mind. Mr. Bradshaw replied in the negative but indicated that he was confident that a tenant could be found.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the application.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he believed that the applicant had spent his money unwisely; however, since the previous owner of the property had not advised him of the non-conforming status of the commercial use than occupying the property, he would be reluctant to vote for disapproval of the subject application.

Mr. Steele remarked that 3-R reports are customarily issued when properties are transferred in San Francisco; and those reports indicate whether the properties in question are subject to restrictions such as non-conforming use termination.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that he had not received a 3-R report when he had purchased the subject property.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the other applications which had been approved by the Commission had authorized 10-year extensions, asked if it would be possible for the Commission to authorize an extension for a shorter period of time. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the property could be used as a building contractor's storage space if the application were to be approved. Mr. Steele replied in the negative, indicating that such a use is illegal in a residential neighborhood.

August 27, 1970

Commissioner Newman asked if the laundry and dry cleaning use being proposed by the applicant would be permitted if the application were to be approved. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative. However, he recommended that the application be taken under advisement until such time as the applicant has obtained a tenant for the building.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6603 be adopted and that the application be approved for a 5-year period subject to appropriate conditions governing the appearance of the building and the hours of operation of any use which might be installed in the building and with an additional condition requiring that any commercial use proposed for the building must be brought before the City Planning Commission for approval.

CU70.56 - 2145-47 Judah Street; Lot 37-A Block 1827; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming use, a real estate office and a driving school, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6604.

CU70.57 - 1624 - 48th Avenue; Lot 39 in Block 1836; in an R-2 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming use, a T.V. and radio repair service, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6605.

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. The names are given in alphabetical order of their surnames.

1. Mr. J. H. Smith, residing at 123 Main Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He has been a resident of this town for many years and is well known to the community.

2. Mr. W. B. Jones, residing at 456 Elm Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

3. Mr. C. D. Brown, residing at 789 Oak Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

4. Mr. E. F. Green, residing at 101 Pine Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

5. Mr. G. H. White, residing at 234 Maple Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

6. Mr. I. J. Black, residing at 567 Cedar Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

7. Mr. K. L. Gray, residing at 890 Birch Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

8. Mr. M. N. Hall, residing at 1123 Spruce Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

9. Mr. O. P. Young, residing at 1456 Willow Street, is elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1911. He is a native of this town and has been a resident for many years.

August 27, 1970

CU70.58 - 1201 Diamond Street; Lot 20 in Block 6562; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the staff recommendation.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6606.

CU70.59 - 3583 Mission Street; Lot 26 in Block 5712; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a real estate office, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6607.

CU70.60 - 22 Louisburg Street; Lot 2-A in Block 7023; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a grocery store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were included in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6608.

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

1991-12-15

1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15 1991-12-15

August 27, 1970

CU70.61 - 3543-45 Mission Street; Lot 39 in Block 5712; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a sewing and alteration shop, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6609.

CU70.62 - 3920 Mission Street; Lot 4 (Portion) in Block 6720; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a retail auto parts store, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6610.

CU70.63 - 3623 - 18th Street; Lot 75 in Block 3587; in an R-4 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, an appliance repair shop, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition of the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6611.

August 27, 1970

CU70.46 - 1360 Church Street; Lot 2 in Block 6652; in an R-3 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, a cabinet and carpentry shop, be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition of the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commissioner Resolution No. 6612.

CU70.65 - 374-B Capital Avenue; Lot 26 in Block 7107; in an R-1 Zoning District.

Mr. Steele recommended that the request for extension of the subject non-conforming commercial use, an electrical appliance repair shop, be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution in which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

No one was present in the audience to speak in opposition to the recommendation of the staff.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6613.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 3, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 3, 1970, at 1:30 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Thomas J. Miller, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and John Ritchie, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, member of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the City Planning Department was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V; Daniel Sullivan, Planner III; Patricia Peterson, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had attended a meeting of the Bernal Heights Association on Wednesday night to discuss the Improvement Plan for Residence.

The Director reminded the Commission that a public hearing has been scheduled on the Improvement Plan for Residence for Monday evening September 14, at the Balboa High School Auditorium.

The Director advised the Commission that he planned to leave before the conclusion of the scheduled zoning hearing in order to be present at a Public Hearing being held by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission for consideration of the development proposed for Piers 1 thru 7 north of the Ferry Building.

ZONING HEARING

CU70.26 - 1321 - 26th Avenue, west line, 199 feet south of Irving Street.
Request for expansion of an existing parking lot for the Chapel of the Sunset Mortuary; in an R-2 District.

(Under Advisement from meetings of June 4 & 18 and August 6, 1970.)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), stated that he had previously recommended that the subject application be disapproved; however, after the Commission had indicated it's desire to approve the application, the matter had been taken under advisement to enable the staff

THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

RE: THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
TO: THE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

1. The National Bureau of Investigation (NBI) is a federal law enforcement agency that is responsible for investigating and preventing crimes against the United States. The NBI is headed by the Director, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

2. The NBI is organized into several divisions, each of which is responsible for a specific area of law enforcement. These divisions include the Criminal Division, the Civil Rights Division, the Identification Division, and the Training Division.

3. The NBI is also responsible for conducting research and analysis on crime trends and patterns. This research is used to develop new investigative techniques and to provide information to other law enforcement agencies. The NBI also provides technical assistance and training to state and local law enforcement agencies.

4. The NBI is a critical component of the federal law enforcement system and plays a vital role in maintaining the safety and security of the United States.

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover, Director
Bureau of Investigation
U. S. Department of Justice

5. The NBI is also responsible for conducting investigations into the activities of foreign intelligence and subversive organizations. This work is often done in cooperation with other federal agencies and with law enforcement agencies in other countries.

6. The NBI is a highly professional and dedicated organization that is committed to the highest standards of law enforcement. The NBI's work is essential to the protection of the United States and its citizens.

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover, Director
Bureau of Investigation
U. S. Department of Justice

7. The NBI is a highly professional and dedicated organization that is committed to the highest standards of law enforcement. The NBI's work is essential to the protection of the United States and its citizens.

September 3, 1970

of the Department of City Planning to prepare appropriate conditions for consideration by the Commission. He distributed copies of a draft resolution of approval which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission; and he summarized and commented on the seven specific conditions which the draft resolution contained.

Ralph J. McGill, representing the applicants, submitted a letter which he had received from Mike Fusaro, President of the Irving Street Merchants Association Inc., in support of the subject application. He also indicated that the conditions contained in the draft resolution, including the condition specifying that the driveway on the 26th Avenue footage of the subject lot could not be used for access to the property would be acceptable.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6614 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM70.26 - Homewood Terrace, Ocean Avenue, north line, 120 feet west of Faxon Avenue.

R-1-D to R-2 & C-2 Districts

(Postponed from meeting of August 6, 1970)

CU70.77 - Homewood Terrace, Ocean Avenue, north line, 130 feet west of Faxon Avenue.

Request for a planned unit development consisting of 300 to 335 dwelling units and 125,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor area; in R-2 & C-2 Districts.

(Postponed from meeting of August 6, 1970).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), noted that considerable discussion had taken place concerning the subject applications during the hearing on August 6; however, since the advertisement announcing that hearing had erroneously stated that the request was for re-classification of property from R-1-D to C-2 for a depth of 200 feet rather than 300 feet along the Ocean Avenue frontage, the matter had been re-advertised for public hearing at today's meeting. After referring to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property, Mr. Steele summarized the type of project which the applicants proposed to undertake on the site.

William Coblentz, attorney for the applicant, stated that the model of the proposed project was available in the meeting room if the Commission wished to have the proposal described in greater detail. He noted that a question had been raised during the last hearing as to whether merchants presently doing business in the neighborhood would be able to acquire a space within the pro-

[illegible]

• •

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to recognize that a problem exists. This is often done by comparing current performance with a desired state or goal. If there is a discrepancy, a problem is identified.

1. The first step is to identify the problem. This involves understanding the situation and the goals that need to be achieved.

September 3, 1970

posed project; and, in response, he remarked that his clients intended to work closely with businessmen from the area and to welcome them as tenants in the proposed project if that were their desire. While a decision had been made as to the general kind of activities which would take place on the commercial portion of the site, no commitments had yet been made for rental of the commercial space.

Barry Wasserman, architect for the applicant, noted that residents of the area had raised objections regarding the proposal to use Elmwood Way for access to the commercial portion of the project; and, after discussing that matter, he and his clients had decided that such access was actually extraneous to the project and that they would be prepared to accept a condition forbidding use of Elmwood Way for access purposes. Questions had also been raised regarding recreational space within the proposed project; and, in that regard, he noted that major portion of the roof covering the commercial building would be available for active recreation in the form of tot lots, basketball courts, tennis courts, or other similar facilities. He believed that the roof top recreation space would be sufficient to meet the needs of the residential portion of the project; and, in fact, it would probably serve to overcome the lack of recreational space in the adjacent residential neighborhood. Mr. Wasserman stated that plans for the proposed project had been reviewed by the Fire Department; and he had been advised that the project, as designed, would meet the requirements of that department. During the Commission's last hearing of the subject application, a representative of the Ocean View - Merced Heights - Ingleside Community Association, Inc. had invited the applicants to attend a meeting of that organization to discuss the proposed development; and, although it had turned out that there was not room for the discussion on the agenda, an effort had been made to get as much information as possible to the members of that organization.

Finally, Mr. Wasserman remarked on the concern which had been expressed about the proposed project by some of the merchants in the area. He assured the Commission that his clients wished to work with merchants who were already doing business in the area in an effort to strengthen the retail district along Ocean Avenue; and he remarked that some of the merchants in the area do recognize that the additional retail activities will add vitality to the district. He emphasized that more than adequate parking would be provided for the commercial portion of the proposed project; and, he felt that the project would not overload existing on-street parking spaces in the area. Furthermore, the automobile entrance to the commercial portion of the project would be controlled by traffic lights on Ocean Avenue; and sufficient backup space would be provided within the garage to prevent any traffic congestion on Ocean Avenue. If other problems could be foreseen, he indicated that he would be willing to make changes in the design of the project to correct the situation.

During the course of Mr. Wasserman's presentation, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's development.

The second part of the report deals with the economic situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's economic development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's economic development.

The third part of the report deals with the social situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's social development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's social development.

The fourth part of the report deals with the political situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's political development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's political development.

The fifth part of the report deals with the cultural situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's cultural development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's cultural development.

The sixth part of the report deals with the environmental situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's environmental development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's environmental development.

The seventh part of the report deals with the future of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's future development. The author has done a great deal of research and has gathered a wealth of material. The report is well written and is a valuable contribution to the study of the country's future development.

September 3, 1970

Howard Pearson, President of the Westwood Park Home Owners Association, stated that the members of his association agreed that the present R-1-D zoning of the subject site is unrealistic. He stated that the summary of the applicants proposal and a picture of the model had been sent to all of the members of the association; and, the response which had been received had been overwhelmingly in favor of the project. While some objections had been raised regarding possible traffic congestion and the undesirability of commercial competition, most of the respondents had been of the opinion that the project would be an asset for the neighborhood. Objections had also been raised to the proposal to use Elmwood Way for vehicular access to the commercial portion of the project; and, since the applicant had indicated that such access would not be essential to the project, he recommended that Elmwood Way be used only for pedestrian and emergency vehicle access to the site.

Henry Hines, 719 Faxon Avenue, subscribed to the remarks which had been made by Mr. Pearson. In addition, he informed the Commission that eight out of ten residents in his block would be in favor of the proposed project if the height of the project would not exceed an average of 40 feet and if no buildings would be located closer than 25 feet to the property line. He stated that Mr. Wasserman had indicated that such conditions would be acceptable; however, he hoped that they could be formalized by inclusion in the Commission's Resolution of approval. Mr. Hines remarked that residents of the subject neighborhood have an interest in the financial success of the proposed project since failure of the project might be detrimental to the neighborhood; and he believed that the developer would need commercial zoning to a depth of 300 feet rather than 200 feet along Ocean Avenue in order to assure the financial success of the project. With regard to Elmwood Way, he noted that two adjacent property owners had objected strongly to use of the street for vehicle access to the commercial portion of the project; and since use of the street for such access would detract from the quality and character of the adjacent residential neighborhood, he felt use of the street for that purpose should be avoided. While the amount of parking being proposed for the commercial portion of the project would exceed the requirements of the City Planning Code, he urged that additional parking be provided for employees of the various stores be included in the complex. While other projects which had been proposed for the subject site had not been regarded as acceptable by people living in the area, the project presently under consideration had won their support; and, since construction of the project would provide jobs and improve the city's tax base, he urged that it be approved.

Joseph Armin, 150 Southwood Drive, stated that he would be willing to support the subject application providing that the applicants would be willing to eliminate vehicular access to the project over Elmwood Way. He felt that the commercial portion of the proposed project would provide a service for the residents of the neighborhood; however, he believed that it would be essential to close Elmwood Way to vehicular traffic in order to maintain the quiet residential character of the adjacent residential district. While some people had

September 3, 1970

expressed concern about the commercial portion of the project, he noted that the residential portion of the project would bring more people to the area who would need commercial services; and for others such as himself who already live in the neighborhood, the introduction of new commercial enterprises in the area would create greater incentive for shopping in the area instead of traveling to more distant shopping centers.

Charles Meyers, 579 Wildwood Way, remarked that the subject property, a choice and valuable piece of land, is not being used to capacity at the present time and, in fact, it is a fire and safety hazard. He remarked that the city is presently experiencing revenue problems; and, he felt that construction of the proposed project would help to relieve that problem by adding to the local tax base. Although property owners on Wildwood Way are not represented by a neighborhood association, most of them had indicated that they were in support of the proposed project. However, if the project were to be approved, he hoped that the interest of merchants presently doing business in the area would be considered and that they would not be hurt by the project.

Nick Tsiplaklas, owner of property located at 1930 Ocean Avenue, remarked that the shopping district along Ocean Avenue between City College and 19th Avenue has few shoppers and little activity; and property owners are finding it difficult to rent their buildings. Under the circumstances, he felt that the proposed commercial portion of the proposed project would improve the shopping climate on Ocean Avenue by increasing the commercial activity in the area.

Oscar Fisher, representing the west of Twin Peaks Central Council, stated that he had nothing to add to the comments which he had made at the previous hearing except to emphasize his feeling that the applicants had acted properly in dealing with residents in the subject neighborhood and involving them in preparation of the plans for the development. He agreed with previous speakers that it would be desirable to close Elmwood Way to pedestrian traffic since lack of pedestrian access might serve to discourage customers of the shopping center from parking in the residential area.

President Newman asked Mr. Fisher about the membership of his organization. Mr. Fisher replied that the West of Twin Peaks Central Council represents 13 home-owners associations.

Henry Gustofferson, owner of commercial property directly across Ocean Avenue from the subject site, felt that the proposed project would improve the neighborhood. He supported the applicants request for commercial zoning to a depth of 300 feet along Ocean Avenue and remarked that the average depth of one hundred or one hundred and twenty five feet for existing commercial properties on Ocean Avenue is obsolete since that commercial zone was established before parking became a serious problem. In any case, he noted that the developers of the project previously proposed for the subject site had requested commercial zoning to a depth of 400 feet from Ocean Avenue.

The first of the series of experiments was conducted on July 1st, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

The second experiment was conducted on July 2nd, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the temperature on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

The third experiment was conducted on July 3rd, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the surface area of the solid on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

The fourth experiment was conducted on July 4th, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the catalyst on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

The fifth experiment was conducted on July 5th, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the concentration of the catalyst on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

The sixth experiment was conducted on July 6th, 1917. The purpose of this experiment was to determine the effect of the concentration of the reactants on the rate of reaction. The results of this experiment are shown in the following table:

September 3, 1970

Mr. Revell, one of the developers of the proposed project, expressed his appreciation to residents of the neighborhood who had come to the meeting to speak in support of the application and remarked that he was gratified that they had recognized the problems which were being faced. He stated that he and his associates had spent a great deal of money in preparing plans for the property; and he felt that the development being proposed would be the finest project which could be constructed on the difficult site.

Commissioner Porter asked when construction would begin on the site if the subject application were to be approved. Mr. Revell estimated that construction would begin in approximately eight months.

Mrs. Holman, a resident of Westwood Park, assumed that approval of the subject application by the Commission would involve a statement on the part of the Commission to the effect that the project would blend appropriately with the subject neighborhood and with the city; and, as a result, she felt that the Commission should question whether the proposed project would tax existing facilities such as libraries, schools, and public utilities. She noted that older people who have lived in the subject neighborhood are dying and are being replaced by families with children; and she believed that the 1,000 occupants of the residential portion of the proposed project might overload the facilities which are presently in existence. She remarked that the neighborhood children had played on the subject property area in the past; and she expected that the recreation facilities which would be located on the roof of the commercial portion of the project would be closed to the public. The opening of the BARTD system will provide an additional convenience for the city; however, for the new rapid transit system to provide service for the subject neighborhood, the service of the Municipal Railway will have to be expanded. Mrs. Holman stated that she had measured the size of the existing residential buildings in the neighborhood as depicted on the model of the proposed project and had determined that the houses are actually 2 and $\frac{1}{2}$ times as large as they should be under the circumstances, the massiveness of the proposed project was not apparent. The average density of the subject neighborhood consists of approximately 20 houses per square block; and, given the number of units being proposed for the new development, it would constitute an addition of approximately 17 new blocks of housing in the neighborhood. She assumed that the residential units would be constructed with flexible walls; and, under the circumstances, she hoped that some assurance could be given that a specific number of residential units would not be exceeded on the site. Since public housing was not regarded by residents of the neighborhood as not being acceptable, she believed that they had favored the proposed project only because it would consist of high-cost private housing. However, she felt that even under those circumstances the residents of the area should not have to accept the project exactly as proposed by the developers.

Gregory Calegari, a certified public accountant from the Alamo Square neighborhood, stated that the planning area in which his neighborhood is located is only one half of the size of the planning area in which the subject property is located; yet his neighborhood has in excess of 1,095 units of public housing,

September 3, 1970

whereas the subject neighborhood has only 22 units of public housing. He agreed with the previous speaker that a proposal for public housing on the subject site would not have been deemed to be acceptable; and he felt that the Department of City Planning was following an unfair practice in condoning the "packing" of public housing units in certain areas of the city.

Evander Smith, attorney for the merchants association of the Ingleside area, stated the seventy-five merchants belonging to the association had experienced difficulty in obtaining facts regarding the applicant's proposal. When the facts were finally obtained, the Board of Directors of the Merchants Association had met and voted to oppose the project. Subsequently, a poll had been taken of the members of the Association; and 72 of the 75 members had supported the position taken by the Board of Directors. He submitted a copy of that petition for the record. While some of the residents had remarked that the proposed project would add to the tax base, he suggested that the cost of services which would have to be provided for the project might exceed the revenue which it would bring to the city. He felt that zoning rules are too often made up along the way with changes always available for people with larger economic interests. He remarked that traffic congestion is a terrible problem on Ocean Avenue, particularly during rush hours. In order to solve that problem, the services of the Municipal Railway would have to be expanded; yet, in order to accommodate such an expansion, it would probably be necessary to eliminate the parking zones along Ocean Avenue. Thus, if the subject application were to be approved, he felt that the merchants presently doing business in the area would be destroyed; and, therefore, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

Walter Knox, representing the Central City Council, anticipated that the subject neighborhood would experience the same problems which had already afflicted the south of Market area. As new developments come in, rental rates become too high for small merchants; and they are forced to move out of the city. Subsequently, their place is taken over by the Redevelopment Agency and big business.

Fred Furrer, 6665 Faxon Avenue, stated that his garage opens onto Elmwood Way; and he indicated that he was opposed to having that street open for access to the commercial portion of the proposed project.

Fred Kurlander, an associate of Mr. Smiths, called attention to the fact that he had submitted a letter to members of the Commission prior to the meeting on behalf of the Merchants Association of the Ocean-Ingleside area; and he requested that the letter be made a part of the official record. He believed that the commercial portion of the proposed project would be harmful to merchants who are already located in the area; and he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

September 3, 1970

The secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from Jack Castor, 1700 Ocean Avenue. Mr. Castor believed that the stores already existing in the neighborhood would not be able to compete with discount prices; and, therefore, he urged the Commission to prevent the development of a large discount house on the subject property.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended approval of both the reclassification and the conditional use request for planned unit development authorization. He remarked the present R-1-D zoning of the site would preclude use of the site for low income housing; and, in any case, a density higher than the permitted by the R-1-D zoning district would be appropriate on the site. In response to questions which had been raised by members of the audience, he stated that the Public Utilities Commission does intend to extend Municipal Railway service to the new BART station which will be located in the subject neighborhood; and he indicated that the draft resolution which had been prepared for approval of the conditional use application would contain a condition to limit the residential density which would be permitted on the site. He did not feel that the statements which had been made regarding the unacceptability of public housing on the subject site were true or fair; and, in fact, if a proposal had been made for use of the site for public housing, the staff of the Department of City Planning would probably have supported that proposal as being in appropriate use of the site.

Mr. Steele summarized the nine conditions which were contained in the draft resolution which had been prepared for approval of the conditional use application, noting that condition No. 4 would provide that access to the subject site from Elmwood Way should be designed to be solely for pedestrians and emergency vehicles.

Commissioner Porter asked how many residential units would be allowed on the site. The Director replied that condition No. 1 of the draft resolution would establish a maximum of 335 dwelling units for the site at a density of 1 dwelling unit for each 1,200 square feet of lot area.

Commissioner Porter asked if any assurance could be given that the proposed project would in fact be built if the subject applications were to be approved. The Director replied that approval of the zone changes could not be made contingent upon a specific project; however, he felt that both the R-2 zoning and the C-2 zoning to a depth of 300 feet from Ocean Avenue would provide appropriate standards for development of the site. He believed that the commercial depth of 100 to 125 feet along Ocean Avenue in the immediate vicinity of the site had caused problems for the merchants in the area since it does not provide room for parking; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the 300 foot commercial depth being requested by the applicant would be more appropriate. In conclusion, he noted that approval of the planned unit development authorization being requested would be subject to specific conditions and related directly to the project which had been proposed; and, as a result, the benefits of that authorization could not be used for any other development on the site.

September 3, 1970

Commissioner Porter, noting that the developer had indicated that construction would begin within 8 months if the subject applications were to be approved, suggested that condition No. 9 of the draft resolution, requiring commencement of construction within 5 years, should be modified. Commissioner Ritchie agreed and suggested that a 3-year limitation would be more appropriate.

Mr. Coblentz stated that he had no objection to such a modification.

Mr. Armin, noting that the recommendation of the staff was that Elmwood Way was to be used solely for access to the site by pedestrians and emergency vehicles, stated that he would prefer to have no pedestrian access to the site over the street; and he indicated that the applicants had previously indicated that they would not object to such a restriction.

Commissioner Ritchie indicated that he agreed with Mr. Armin and suggested that the street should be used only as an access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Steele stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had felt that pedestrian access to the site via Elmwood Way would be a convenience for residents of the neighborhood; and, since more than adequate parking would be available on the site, he felt that use of the residential neighborhood for parking would be precluded. However, if residents of the subject neighborhood felt strongly on the issue, he would not object to modification of the draft resolution.

Commissioner Porter remarked that people do not always park where they should; and she believed that customers of the shopping center would park in the residential neighborhood if pedestrian access to the site were available via Elmwood Way. Under the circumstances, she agreed that Elmwood Way should be closed to vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

President Newman asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution, as revised with regard to Elmwood Way and the deadline for starting of construction on the site, were acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Coblentz replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6615 be adopted and that application ZM70.26 be approved.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6616 be adopted and that application CU70.77 be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution, as revised.

24. Again, noting that the recommendation of the audit was that the

[illegible][illegible]

September 3, 1970

ZM70.25 - 960 and 984 Haight Street, north line, 47.5 feet east of Broderick.
R-3 to an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), remarked that the subject application had previously been scheduled for hearing during the meeting of Aug. 6, 1970; however, since the list of property owners within a 300 foot radius of the subject site as submitted by the applicant had contained a number of errors, the application had been re-scheduled for hearing during the present meeting. During the interim, he had personally checked the owners of record of property within a 300-foot radius of the subject site as listed in the records of the Assessor's Office and had mailed a new notice of the public hearing to those individuals. After referring to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property, he indicated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the property from R-3 to R-4 with the intent of constructing a turnkey housing project on the site if the application were to be approved. He noted, however, that the Commission does not have the authority to establish conditions when approving reclassification requests; and, as a result, any of the uses permitted by the City Planning Code in an R-4 district could be constructed on the site if the reclassification request were to be approved.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he had received a letter from Henry Arian, 275 Princeton Avenue, Mill Valley, requesting postponement of the scheduled hearing; and he asked if the Commission wished to honor that request.

Mr. Arian, who was present in the audience, stated that his attorney would be out of the county until September 20; however, he indicated that he was prepared to make a statement if the Commission wished to proceed with the hearing as scheduled.

After asking for a show of hands of people present in the audience who wished to be heard on the subject application, the Commission decided to proceed with the hearing as scheduled.

Thomas Hsieh, architect for the applicant, emphasized that there is a great need for the type of housing which his client proposed to construct on the site; however, the housing could not be constructed unless the requested change of zone were to be approved. He advised the Commission that the site had previously been developed with a building which contained more than 50 dwelling units; however, the site had been vacant since 1961 and had become a neighborhood eyesore.

September 3, 1970

Mr. Arian read and submitted a letter the text of which was as follows:

"As owner and part owner of three separate parcels of real estate in the Haight-Ashbury district, I feel that I must speak out in opposition to the requested change in zoning from R-3 to R-4 of lots 17 and 18 in Assessor's Block 1237.

"The applicant requests rezoning of subject property in order to construct thereon an apartment house with twelve floors of occupancy. Photographs taken of the area show that this type of structure is totally out of keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood. Such a structure would tower from a minimum of fifty to one hundred feet or more above its neighbors. The only building in the surrounding area more than forty feet in height is the seven story apartment house on the northeast corner of Broderick and Haight Streets, which would be dwarfed by its 140 to 150 foot high neighbor.

"Applicant states that the change in zoning is required in order to build low rental housing for families and elderly under the San Francisco Housing Authority 'TURNKEY' program. Stressed in the application is the 'serious shortage' of low rental housing in San Francisco. This shortage, however, is not only due to the difficulty in securing suitable sites that meet government financing requirements. I am personally familiar with several sites in addition to those mentioned in the recent IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR RESIDENCE by our Planning Director.

"As one example, allow me to cite a 'TURNKEY' proposal made at the request of the San Francisco Housing Authority for housing for the elderly, initiated on February 29, 1968. The 8,250 square foot parcel in question is located on the northeast corner of Page and Broderick Streets, less than one block away from applicant's lots. This corner parcel was designated R-4 in the city's master plan.

"In keeping with the prevalent official opinion that public housing should blend into the neighborhood and not stick out like a sore thumb, the architect's design showed a three-story building having 25 dwelling units. This project was submitted to the San Francisco Planning Department by the Housing Authority on May 1, 1968. Mr. Allan B. Jacobs, Planning Director, responded as follows on August 9, 1968:

September 3, 1970

'Elderly housing on this site can be considered quite appropriate given the moderate intensity of development in the neighborhood, reasonable transit services, nearby open space and shopping facilities, all within two blocks. It is worthy of note that only 25 units are proposed here when 41 units would be permitted under the R-4 regulations of the code. The proposed development of three stories is also in general conformity with the neighborhood, and therefore would seem proper'

"Planning continued on this project. It was redesigned to 41 dwelling units at the request of the Housing Authority Planners and generally approved by the H.A.O. office of H.U.D. Finally, on March 26, 1969, after thirteen months of assurances that the project was slated for an early construction start, a letter was received from the Housing Authority rejecting the site as too steep and too close to the Haight-Ashbury District.

"Now a request for rezoning is before you, in the identical neighborhood, with identical or more severe slope conditions, which eventually should be similarly rejected when reviewed by all the different departments of the San Francisco Housing Authority, leaving the Developer with nothing more than an increased value on his land, due to a change in zoning from R-3 to R-4.

"In this neighborhood of generally stable, two to four story dwellings, a high-rise structure would appear to be entirely out of place. Taking into consideration the very real shortage of low rental housing, it would seem very desirable to build, at the earliest possible date, the 68 units mentioned by the applicant. The people of the City of San Francisco, however, would be better served by appropriate use of both the properties described herein, each as presently zoned. Forty-one units for the elderly can be built on the view corner site at Page and Broderick Streets, while subject property, under its present R-3 and R-4 zoning, could sustain either 27 family units or 13 elderly units on the R-4 portion and 14 family units on the R-3 lots as presently zoned. The sum total would provide San Francisco with the same 68 dwelling units so urgently needed, without destruction of the neighborhood height pattern.

"Commission denial of this application will assure, at least for some time to come, a continuance of the present neighborhood scale."

September 3, 1970

At the conclusion of his remarks, Mr. Arian submitted photographs of the subject neighborhood with overlays to illustrate the effect which an R-4 building on the subject site could have on the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Hans Schiller, architect for Mr. Arian, stated that he had no disagreement with those who had argued that it is highly essential that a maximum number housing should be constructed in the city; however, he felt that encouragement of new residential development should not be made on a piecemeal basis. He believed that the Commission should not arbitrarily increase the density of a single parcel of property merely to encourage residential development of the site; however, if the Commission were to take the position that the need for housing is so essential that such actions are justified, then he would urge his client to request that his property be reclassified, also. If the property owned by his client were to be reclassified from R-4 to R-5, the site could easily accommodate 80 dwelling units for the elderly on 8 floors of occupancy with only 75% coverage of the lot; and the cost of the land would be reduced to \$1,000 per unit, a most extraordinary figure in these days. Under the circumstances, if the Commission were not prepared to treat all property owners alike, he felt that the Commission should view the subject application with reluctance, especially since it was unlikely that the Housing Authority would approve the turnkey housing project for the site; and, in the absence of that approval, the requested reclassification would have no effect other than to improve the value of the property.

Gregory Calegari, representative of the Alamo Square Association, acknowledged that the subject property is located on the perimeter of the area with which his Association is concerned. Nevertheless, he was concerned about the proposal. He remarked that the requested reclassification would allow the subject site to be developed with a building which would be totally out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. Furthermore, the area within a 5-block radius of Alamo Square already contains a 1500 units of public housing; and he did not feel that a single neighborhood should be allowed to become completely saturated with public housing units. Since he did not believe that the proposal for construction of a turnkey housing project on the subject site could be separated from the request for rezoning, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

Wesley Dawe, President of the Buena Vista Association, endorsed the remarks which had been made by Mr. Calegari.

The Secretary called attention to a letter which had been received from James Browne, Secretary of the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, stating that the subject application could not be discussed with the membership of this association until the second week of September and requesting that he be kept informed regarding plans for the proposed turnkey project.

September 3, 1970

Mr. Steele stated that he had received a letter from Everett H. Heynne, Principal Planner for the Housing Authority, stating that the Housing Authority did not wish to involve itself with questions of zoning and that it would rely on the discretion of the City Planning Commission in the present instance. Mr. Steele remarked that reclassification of the subject property to R-4 would allow a more intense development of the site with no specific height restrictions; however, approval of the reclassification request would constitute an extension of a fairly sizeable R-4 district which already exists to the west of the site. While the existing R-4 district has not been developed to the maximum extent possible under R-4 zoning standards, it has been heavily developed. He noted that the subject site has been vacant for a number of years; and he believed that reclassification of the property to R-4 would encourage its development for appropriate housing under the turnkey program or on the private market. Therefore, he recommended the subject application be approved. Concluding his remarks, he noted that the property owned by Mr. Arian does not abut an R-5 district; and, therefore, reclassification of that property to R-5 would constitute spot zoning and would be illegal. He also remarked that the proposal for use of the subject property for a turnkey housing project would have to come before the Commission in the future as a Master Plan Referral if the request for reclassification were to be approved; and he noted that the Commission had previously supported a policy requiring that public housing units should be distributed evenly throughout the city and not clustered in certain neighborhoods.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he would like to have an opportunity to see plans for the proposed turnkey housing project before acting on the requested reclassification even though the only matter properly before the Commission has the request for reclassification.

After further discussion, Commissioner Porter moved that the subject application be approved.

Commissioner Miller stated that he would not be inclined to support the request for reclassification of the property in the absence of a demonstrated need for additional R-4 zoning in the area, especially since the Zoning Administrator had indicated that the existing district had not been developed to its full potential.

Commissioner Porter's motion failed for a want of a second.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement until the meeting of October 1, 1970.

ZM70.27 - 24, 28, 32 and 36 Sussex Street, northeast line, approximately 175 feet northwest of the intersection of Bemis, Sussex & Castro Streets.
R-1 to an R-2 District.

September 3, 1970

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the property from R-1 to R-2 so that it could be used for construction of four 2-family dwellings for sale to the San Francisco Housing Authority under the turnkey program. He noted that the subject lots are located in the middle of an R-1 zoned portion of the Glen Park neighborhood which is developed predominantly with single family dwellings.

Frank W. Brady, the applicant, stated that the owners of the subject property had built single family houses on two of the six parcels of property which they own; however, they had not been able to sell the houses. As a result, he had visited the Department of City Planning to inquire about the possibility of reclassifying the remaining lots; and the staff of the Department of City Planning had suggested that he investigate the turnkey housing program. Subsequently, he had discussed the matter with the Housing Authority and had been advised that they would be interested in any development which would provide eight dwelling units on the four lots. Since construction of two dwelling units on each of the lots would require reclassification of the property to R-2, he had decided to file the subject application to see if rezoning of the property would be acceptable to the Commission.

The Secretary read a letter which had been received from Everett H. Heyneman, Principal Planner for the Housing Authority, as follows:

"This is in reference to your letter of July 31, 1970, in which you transmit Mr. Frank Brady's Variance Application.

"As you know we are extremely sensitive to the issues of rezoning and do not like to become involved.

"Indeed, I had a preliminary discussion with the developer re subject location, which discussion evolved around a potential development within the existing zoning.

"At no time have we ever suggested or required this area to be reclassified.

"As such, we do not approve or support this application."

Mr. Steele stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not, to his knowledge, suggested that reclassification of the subject property would be appropriate; however, when inquiries are made regarding potential uses of property, the staff does suggest that property owners contact the Housing Authority regarding the turnkey housing program in instances where such housing might be appropriate.

The American Medical Association is a national organization of medical practitioners, organized for the purpose of promoting the science and art of medicine, and for the betterment of the human race. It is a non-profit corporation, organized under the laws of the United States, and is the largest and most influential of the medical organizations in this country. It is composed of more than 50,000 members, who are organized into local, state, and national associations. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world.

The Association is organized into a hierarchy of local, state, and national associations. The local associations are the primary units of the organization, and are composed of medical practitioners who are interested in the advancement of the medical profession in their own communities. The state associations are composed of the local associations of a particular state, and are organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in that state. The national association is composed of the state associations, and is organized for the purpose of promoting the interests of the medical profession in the United States. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world.

The Association is a non-profit corporation, organized under the laws of the United States, and is the largest and most influential of the medical organizations in this country. It is composed of more than 50,000 members, who are organized into local, state, and national associations. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world.

The Association is a non-profit corporation, organized under the laws of the United States, and is the largest and most influential of the medical organizations in this country. It is composed of more than 50,000 members, who are organized into local, state, and national associations. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world.

The Association is a non-profit corporation, organized under the laws of the United States, and is the largest and most influential of the medical organizations in this country. It is composed of more than 50,000 members, who are organized into local, state, and national associations. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world. The Association is a member of the International Medical Association, and is in communication with the medical organizations of all the leading nations of the world.

September 3, 1970

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the members of the Commission had made a field trip to the subject properties, remarked that it should not be difficult to design a turnkey housing project which would be as attractive or more attractive than the housing which already exists on the street; and he wondered if the developers had prepared any drawings to illustrate the type of project which they proposed to construct on the subject property. Mr. Brady replied in the negative, indicating that he preferred to have the zoning issue resolved before spending money for preparation of plans.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the applicant would construct buildings which would be less monotonous than those which are located across the street from the subject property. Mr. Brady replied in the affirmative.

Mrs. Scripps, representing the Glen Park Property Owners Association, stated that the members of her Association would be opposed to having the subject properties removed from the tax rolls. Under the circumstances, she felt that the property should be developed and rented on the private market.

Joan Seiwald, a resident of the Glen Park neighborhood, stated that property owners in the area had supported the Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Program on the theory that the program would help to retain the R-1 character of the area. If the subject neighborhood has a bad appearance at the present time, she felt that the city's failure to provide basic services was at fault; and she did not believe that reclassification of the subject properties to R-2 would help to improve the situation.

Mrs. Joseph Kelley, 75 Sussex Street, stated that all of the lots in the subject block are developed with single family houses with the exception of the four presently under consideration; and she noted the property to the rear of the subject lots had been developed to a very high density by the Kate Maremont Foundation. Given the narrowness of the streets in the area and the lack of adequate parking facilities, she did not feel that the density of the subject lots should be increased.

Phillip Fanning, 60 Sussex Street, stated that he had purchased his home one year ago and had refurbished it under the FACE program; and he indicated that he had chosen the subject neighborhood because of it's single family character. He remarked that the streets in the neighborhood are narrow and overly congested; and he felt that the subject property should be used for construction of attractive single family houses unlike the two which had already been constructed by the owners of the subject property and which were badly designed.

Mrs. Vernan Franz, 75 Sussex Street, stated that she had lived in the subject neighborhood for seventeen years; and she indicated that she would be opposed to any "spot zoning" in the area especially if introduction of R-2 zoning might result in the legalization of a number of illegal apartments in the area.

September 3, 1970

Mr. Steele stated that no need had been demonstrated for increased density in the subject neighborhood; and, since approval of the subject application would result in "spot zoning", he recommended that the application be disapproved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6617 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

At 4:10 P.M. President Newman announced a ten-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:20 P.M. and proceeded with hearing the remainder of the agenda.

CU70.75 - 2424 Pine Street, north line, 146 feet east of Pierce Street.
Request for conversion of an existing dwelling to professional offices for a law firm; in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property had been acquired for use as professional law offices by the applicants on June 30, 1969; and the subject application had been filed requesting permission to continue the office use of the victorian style building on the lot. He stated that two lawyers, two secretaries and one summer researcher now occupy the building. At the end of the summer, a third lawyer may be added to the staff; however, maximum occupancy will be five persons. He stated that St. Dominic's Priory across Pine Street had made four parking spaces available to the applicants for their use.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to five specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Joseph Rhine, one of the applicants, stated that he had no objection to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6618 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU70.78 - Allright Parking Lot, Van Ness Avenue, east line, between Elm Street & Golden Gate Avenue.
Request for construction of 15 mechanical "Piggyback" automobile parking units for open parking lot with a potential maximum of 80 such units to be constructed in the future; in a C-2 District.

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

2. The second part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

4. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

5. The fifth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

6. The sixth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

7. The seventh part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

8. The eighth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

9. The ninth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

10. The tenth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

11. The eleventh part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

12. The twelfth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

13. The thirteenth part of the paper is devoted to a detailed discussion of the problem of the origin of life. It is shown that the problem is one of the most important and most difficult in the history of science.

September 3, 1970

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had proposed to install 15 mechanical lift automobile parking units along the eastern property line during the initial phases of the proposed project. At some future date, an additional 65 parking units might be installed on the lot. A six-foot redwood slat fence would be installed along Golden Gate Avenue in the beginning; and protective fencing would be provided in an accumulative fashion if new parking units were added on the site. No additional landscaping had been proposed. Mr. Steele stated that each space'o'matic unit is eight feet wide and has a six-foot two-inch clearance within the lower space. Each unit would be in a position to leave a 3-foot clearance for the abutting buildings.

Leon Rimov, representing the applicant, stated that the mechanical-lift automobile parking units could not be considered as buildings since their installation would not require the issuance of building permits; however, the lifts had been approved by the International Association of Building Officials. He remarked that he had previously submitted brochures describing the applicant's proposal to members of the Commission; and he felt that installation of the lifts would result in better utilization of the land and better management of the parking lot. While the matter of "screening" had been discussed with the Staff of the Department of City Planning, he and his clients felt that the fencing being proposed should be installed on a progressive basis rather than all at once.

Sam Lord, operator of the subject parking lot, stated that a 2½-foot high curb had already been installed along the property line of the sidewalk to prevent people from walking across the parking lot; and he felt that installation of additional fencing would create an undesirable and unsafe situation which might encourage muggings. Under the circumstances, he urged that the subject application be approved without a condition requiring installation of additional fencing.

The Secretary read a letter which he had received from Adolfo De Urioste, 512 Van Ness Avenue, in opposition to the subject application. Mr. Urioste, noting that the subject property is located within close proximity of the Civic Center and the New Federal Office Building, stated that he felt that the proposed development would not be compatible with the subject neighborhood.

At the request of Mr. Lord, the Secretary read a letter which had been addressed to him from Siegmund O. Grozinger, Western Sales Manager for Space'o'matic America Inc., advising that his firm would be prepared to erect a 40-foot chain fence with attractive wooden slats along Golden Gate Avenue in order to screen the first 15 space'o'matic units to be installed on the subject site.

September 3, 1970

Mr. Steele remarked that the subject property is located at the south end of Van Ness Avenue's "Automobile Row"; and he noted that considerable attention had been given to the screening of open uses in that district. Furthermore, the property is located in close proximity to the Federal Building, the State Building, Civic Center, and Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2. He also noted that Van Ness Avenue has a center strip which has been used for extensive landscaping. Under the circumstances, he did not feel that the mechanical automobile lifts as proposed by the applicant would enhance the attractiveness of the area, particularly since the applicant had indicated that he would not be willing to landscape the subject lot in an appropriate manner, relying only on chain link fencing with wood slates. Thus, he recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6619 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU70.80 - 1000 Fulton Street, northwest corner of Steiner Street.

Request for continued use of building as a residential treatment center for youths, an Eleemosynary Institution; in an R-4 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the subject application had been filed by the San Francisco Boys Home, an institution providing a residential treatment program for teenage wards of the Juvenile Court. The application requested permission to continue the current program of the institution with 20 boys in the program and a minimum staff of 2 counselors, 2 social workers, the Director, and Education Director, cooks, office administrators, and visiting psychiatrists for individual and group therapy. He stated that the nature of the Institution's program had changed emphasis from earlier years, when the center was operated as a boarding home to the present care of emotionally disturbed boys; however, the basic nature of the use and activity of the site had remained essentially the same. Filing of the subject application had arisen because of a requirement of the State Department of Mental Hygiene for zoning clearance from the City and County of San Francisco.

Brian F. Cahill, representing the applicant, stated that the San Francisco Boys Home had made a casual transition from a residential program to a more active treatment program. When it had become necessary to apply to the state for a new license, the need for zoning clearance of the use had arisen; and as a result, the subject application had been filed. Mr. Cahill stated that the institution has a staff ratio of two employees for each youngster being treated; and he indicated that the purpose of the subject application was to enable the Institution to continue the program in which it has been involved.

September 3, 1970

The Secretary called attention to letters which had been received from John L. Burton, Assemblyman, 20th District, Philip Burton, Member of Congress, and from Peter C. Witmer, President of the Alamo Square Association, in support of the subject application.

Mr. Parmenter, 919 Fulton Street, stated that the subject neighborhood had deteriorated since the time that the Archbishop had vacated the building occupying the subject site; and, given the fact that a Catholic Church located at Fell and Fillmore Streets had supported S.D.S., he questioned the desirability of allowing the church to continue operation of a non-residential use of the subject property.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter absented herself from the meeting room.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be approved subject to two conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Cahill stated that the conditions being recommended by Mr. Steele were acceptable to him.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6620 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU70.81 - 146 Blake Street, east line, 175 feet south of Feary Blvd.

Request for increase of occupancy from six to eight aged persons in an existing Residential Care Home; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property is presently used as a residential care home housing six ambulatory patients; and the applicant had requested permission to increase the occupancy of the residential care home from six to eight persons. Mr. Steele remarked that the building occupying the subject site had recently undergone some substantial alterations resulting in the addition of four bedrooms, two bathrooms, a dining room, a two-bedroom apartment on the ground floor, and a six-foot sundeck for elderly residents at the rear of the building; however, the staircase from the sundeck extends into the required rear yard area in violation of the City Planning Code.

The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The second of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The third of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The fourth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The fifth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The sixth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The seventh of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

The eighth of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is now engaged in some form of industrial or commercial activity. This is a result of the rapid growth of the manufacturing and commercial industries since the middle of the nineteenth century.

September 3, 1970

Robert Peterson, attorney for the applicant, stated that the building occupying the subject site had been expanded to accommodate eight patients; however, unless the subject application were approved, a maximum of six patients would be allowed on the site. He stated that his clients had spent approximately \$5,000 to install a sprinkler system and other features which would not be required if the occupancy of the home were to be limited to six patients; and, under the circumstances, he hoped that the subject application would be approved so that the property could be used to accommodate the number of patients for which the building had been designed.

No one else was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be approved subject to seven specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. He noted that condition No. 2 of the draft resolution would require removal of the stairway which projects illegally into the required rear yard area of the site; however, the applicant had verbally agreed to remove the stairway. After summarizing and commenting upon the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution, he recommended its adoption.

Mr. Peterson stated that he had no objection to the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6621 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter returned to the meeting room and re-assumed her seat at the Commission table.

CU70.79 - University of San Francisco.

Request for construction of a 3-story building adjacent to St. Ignatius Church and removal of 36 off-street parking spaces; in an R-3 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the University of San Francisco proposed to construct a three-story complex adjacent to St. Ignatius Church on Fulton Street for the schools of business administration and education. The proposed building would contain approximately 63,000 square feet of space and would require removal of 36 off-street for approximately 116 cars would be provided on the existing 30 car parking lot adjacent to the Law School. The net addition of parking spaces up on completion of that project would be 50 spaces. The building presently being proposed would not result in any increase in enrollment for the university.

September 3, 1970

Father Timothy McDonald, representing the University of San Francisco, stated that the University had already demolished an older building which had been used for general education classes, a treasurer's office, and as a residence for some faculty members. That building had been demolished because it was in a bad state of deterioration and because its rehabilitation did not seem feasible. As a result, the decision had been made to construct a new modern building on the site.

Father McDonald remarked that residents of the subject neighborhood had previously expressed a considerable amount of aggravation about parking, traffic congestion, and lack of landscaping on the campus. With regard to parking, he stated that the University had attempted to solve the problem by providing more parking spaces than had been required by a draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning in 1967. Whereas the draft resolution had called for only 144 parking spaces, the University had volunteered to provide 190 parking spaces. However, when the parking spaces became available, the students chose to continue parking on the streets; and the parking spaces remained unused. He remarked that the Department of Public Works cannot legally designate on-street parking spaces for use by specific individuals, such as residents of the street; and, under the circumstances, when students are parked legally on the street, there is nothing that anyone can do about the situation. If, on the other hand, the students are parked on the street illegally, the residents of the neighborhood have a right to call the police department and demand that the automobiles be tagged or towed. In an effort to make use of parking areas which have not been used in the past, the security department of the University had recently decided to issue parking permits for specific parking lots on the campus; and, as a result, it was estimated that an additional 50 or 60 cars would be removed from public street in the area during peak hours. In addition, the University would be willing to encourage and assist in the tagging and towing of cars belonging to students which are illegally parked in the surrounding neighborhood. Yet, inspite of everything that the University might do, he doubted that students could be made to forego the use of available curbside parking spaces even in cases where the students have obtained valid permits to park in University-owned parking lots.

Father McDonald stated that only seven of the 17 houses which were constructed on McAllister Street before the advent of automobiles have added garages; and, in one case, one garage had been provided to serve a number of apartments contained in the building. Thus, there is a severe shortage of parking on that portion of Turk Street in the vicinity of the University of San Francisco Campus. Stanyan Street has a better ratio of garages to dwelling units as well as adequate driveway space for the off-street parking of automobiles; yet, Stanyan Street has become a major traffic artery serving north-south traffic; and that traffic has become a major annoyance both to residents of the street and to the University. The University itself has a smaller student-body than it had two years ago; and during the interim, it has expanded onto the site formally occupied by St. Ignatius High School.

September 3, 1970

During the fall semester, he estimated that the enrollment of daytime classes will decrease by 5% and that the enrollment of evening classes will decrease by 30%; and, given the fact that the parking spaces previously used by the faculty of St. Ignatius High School would no longer frequent the area, he felt that the parking situation in the neighborhood should have improved significantly since expansion of the campus was previously proposed in 1967.

With regard to landscaping, Father McDonald remarked that the University's Campus is already much more attractive than the overgrown cemetery previously occupying the site. In addition, the University's architects propose to install landscaping throughout the interior portions of the campus. He noted, however, that installation of the new landscaping would require elimination of 36 existing parking spaces; but he emphasized that those parking spaces would not be removed until June, 1972, by which time BARTD will be in operation. He felt that students should be encouraged to use public transit instead of driving their own automobiles; and, as a result, he felt that the best tactic would be to refuse to provide parking spaces on the campus so that the students would be forced to use public transit. He noted that the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that a new garage should be constructed which might be designed to accommodate air-space development for other uses; however, since benefactors give the University funds for specific uses, and since no funds had been pledged for buildings other than the one presently being proposed, it would not be possible to design a garage which could later be used as the base of a building which would house a use as yet unknown. After conclusion of his presentation, Father McDonald advised the Commission that John Pflueger, architect for the University, was present in the audience to answer any questions which might be raised regarding the proposed building.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was aware that parking is difficult in all residential neighborhoods which are located close to major institutions; and she accepted the fact that fewer people are now bringing fewer automobiles to the University of San Francisco than in 1967 because of the removal of St. Ignatius High School and because of the drop in the enrollment at the University. However, she wondered if it would be possible for the University to issue parking permits which could be affixed permanently to automobiles owned by students so that the automobiles could be quickly identified.

Father McDonald replied that the University had issued parking permits in the form of decals which are designed to be affixed to the bumpers of the student-owned automobiles. With the decals in place, automobiles which are parked in the wrong parking lot in the University campus can be tagged by the campus police; and automobiles which are parked illegally on adjacent streets can be identified by residents of the area. He emphasized that nothing can be done about student-owned automobiles which are legally parked on public streets even if they have the decals; and he remarked that the University has no power to place identifying decals on automobiles owned by students who do not apply for parking permits.

During the past several years, the Commission has been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government.

The Commission has been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government. The Commission has been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government.

Commissioner Gordon stated that she was aware that parking is difficult in the downtown area. She stated that she had been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government.

During the past several years, the Commission has been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government. The Commission has been working to develop a system of public information which would be available to the public in a timely and accurate manner. This system would be based on the principle of "open government" and would be designed to provide the public with the information it needs to make informed decisions about the actions of the government.

September 3, 1970

John Pflueger, architect for the applicant, stated that construction of the building presently being proposed would be consistent with the master plan which had been approved by the City Planning Commission in 1967; however, the master plan would have to be revised to permit the temporary removal of 36 parking spaces on the campus and to authorize the construction of a 116 car parking garage adjacent to the Law School in the future. He stated that the design of the proposed building would permit the retention of some of the larger trees on the campus; and the project would improve access to St. Ignatius Church.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the back wall of the proposed parking garage, adjacent to residential properties, would be solid or open. Mr. Pflueger replied that no plans had yet been prepared for the proposed garage; however, he anticipated that the new garage would be designed somewhat similarly to the existing garage which has a block wall which provides a screening effect. Because of security concerns, he felt that it would not be desirable to design the proposed garage as a completely enclosed structure.

Commissioner Porter remarked that plans for the proposed garage would have to be submitted to the Commission before construction of the garage could be initiated.

Mrs. Robert Winkenback, 40 Temescal Terrace, emphasized the fact that parking congestion is a terrible problem in the subject neighborhood. She acknowledged that the police will respond to complaints when students are illegally parked; however, because the students have no other place to park except on the streets, she did not like to call the police. If the new building being proposed by the University were to be approved by the Commission, she felt that the required parking should be provided immediately and not at some unknown future date.

A resident of the subject neighborhood submitted photographs which he had taken earlier in the year to illustrate the parking problem being faced by the neighborhood; and he noted that the photographs showed that automobiles were being parked at street corners, in front of fire hydrants, in front of driveways, and in other illegal locations. Under the circumstances, he did not see how the Commission could approve the removal of 36 parking spaces from the campus of the University of San Francisco, thus adding 36 more automobiles to those which are already being parked on the streets in the neighborhood. He stated that the residents of the neighborhood are completely isolated from 7:00 A.M. to 10:30 P.M. everyday of the week because no parking spaces are available for visitors; and he felt that it should be the responsibility of the City Planning Commission to improve the situation. He had been advised that the University has an enrollment of 6800 students; yet, even if the enrollment of the University were only 3200 students, as claimed by Father McDonald, the fact remained that only 526 parking spaces are avail-

September 3, 1970

able on the campus. He did not care whether buildings on the campus are landscaped or not; but he felt that some action should be taken to provide adequate parking spaces for the students so that they would not have to park on residential streets in the area. Although students may have a legal right to park on the streets, he felt that the University should have a moral obligation to provide adequate facilities for its students.

Mrs. Lerch remarked that the University has spent more than \$10 million to improve its campus since 1967; and she remarked that any other property owner in the city who wished to improve his property would have been required to provide the number of parking spaces required by the City Planning Code. Whereas the University was once willing to require students to remove automobiles which were illegally parked upon the request of residents of the neighborhood, the University had recently suggested that the neighbors should call the police instead. She stated that she had called the police when students were parked in front of her driveway; however, the police often have more important things to do than to arrange for the towing of illegally parked automobiles. In any case, ticketing or towing of automobiles by the police department would not solve the problem being faced by the neighborhood. She felt that the 36 parking spaces presently existing on the campus should not be removed for construction of the new building; and she believed that a new parking garage should be constructed by the University at an early date. She remarked that the University uses public funds obtained directly and as a result of tax exemptions; and, as a result, she felt that the University should have an obligation to the public in return. She stated that she is a real estate broker, and she advised the Commission that people do not wish to buy houses in areas where no parking is available. As a result, the value of properties in the subject neighborhood has been depreciated. In conclusion, she stated that parking lots on the campus are closed to both students and members of the public on Friday and Saturday nights when major events are held in the auditorium or the gymnasium; and she felt that the least the University could do is to allow its facilities to be used when they are needed.

Marguerite Warren stated that she had been a member of the Board of Directors of the Improvement Club in the subject neighborhood when it was established; and she indicated that the members of that association had requested her to speak in their behalf at the present hearing. She stated that she recognized the moral and legal rights of students and of the University; yet, since the books in the Assessor's Office had indicated that the University has been given a tax exemption of at least \$503,175, she felt that the University should have some moral obligation to respect the rights of tax-paying citizens. Miss Warren noted that students of the University must pay to obtain permits to park on the campus; and she observed that the new parking tax recently legislated by the City will require all individuals who pay a fee for parking to pay a tax in addition. Under the circumstances, she feared that students at the University would no longer be willing to purchase parking permits; and, as a result, she expected that parking congestion in

September 3, 1970

the subject neighborhood might become much more severe unless the University is willing to change its policy of requiring students to pay for parking spaces on the campus. However, if the University were unwilling to change its policy, she felt that the least it could do would be to open its parking lots on Friday and Saturday evenings when major events are scheduled so that the city will be able to benefit to some extent as a result of the new parking tax.

Mitchell Cutler, President of the Francisco Heights Civic Club, stated that he was interested in beautification of the subject neighborhood; and he acknowledged that the University had landscaped the last new parking area which it had installed. However, because of the dire parking situation in the subject neighborhood, he felt that the Commission should not allow the removal of 36 parking spaces as requested by the University. In fact, he felt that the Commission should require the University to provide additional parking spaces to serve the needs of the new building being proposed. He stated that he was not satisfied with the University's promise that parking spaces would be provided at some unknown future date; and he felt that the additional parking spaces should be provided immediately.

The Secretary called attention to communications which had been received from Ted Savetnick and Mr. & Mrs. Stephen Lighthill, 2525 McAllister Street, opposing the removal of 36 parking spaces from the University of San Francisco campus.

Mr. Steele stated that the demand for parking spaces for the students of the University of San Francisco seems to be increasing despite the decrease in enrollment; and he felt that it was possible that the University's policy of collecting fees for on-campus parking spaces might be responsible for the parking congestion in the adjacent residential neighborhood. He felt that the proposal for modernization of the facilities of the University through construction of the new building being proposed and by construction of a new 116 car parking garage would be appropriate; and he recommended that the portions of the subject application requesting permission for those improvements be approved. However, he felt that the proposal for elimination of 36 parking spaces on the campus, amounting to 5% of the parking spaces previously required by City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6083, would not be inconsequential; and it was his recommendation that the Commission should not allow those parking spaces to be removed for any extended period of time. Thus, instead of approving the applicant's request for removal of the 36 parking spaces, he recommended that the spaces be removed only to the extent necessary for the construction of the new building and that a new parking garage should be ready for occupancy upon completion of the new building. He submitted a draft resolution which he had prepared for approval of the application in part and for disapproval of the application in part; and, after summarizing and commenting upon the five conditions which were contained in the draft resolution, he recommended its adoption.

September 3, 1970

Commissioner Porter asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution had been discussed with the representative of the University of San Francisco. Mr. Steele replied that he had not had an opportunity to discuss the specific conditions with the applicant; however, he believed that they had been aware of the general nature of the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Porter stated that she would be unwilling to act on such a complicated recommendation until representatives of the University and the Zoning Committee of the Commission have had an opportunity to review the recommendation in detail. She therefore moved that the subject application be taken under advisement. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ritchie.

Father McDonald stated that he had called Mr. Passmore of the Department of City Planning 10 days ago to inquire if additional information was needed concerning the subject application; and, at that time, nothing had been said to indicate that the staff intended to recommend that the parking garage be constructed concurrently with the new building. Subsequently, two days before the scheduled hearing, Mr. Passmore had telephoned to advise him of the staff recommendation; and he felt that the fact that the staff should wait until the last minute to introduce new material of such major importance was an absurdity. He stated that anyone with any intelligence would know that the combined-use building that the staff was recommending would be impossible to construct. Furthermore, he advised the Commission that the University would lose a grant in excess of 1 million dollars if the new building being proposed in the subject application were not constructed within a certain period of time.

Mr. Steele noted that the Director of Planning had been on vacation; and as a result, it had not been possible for the Staff of the Department of City Planning to obtain his recommendation on the subject application until his return to the office on August 31. Therefore, it had not been possible to discuss the staff recommendation with the University of San Francisco at an earlier date. In any case, he did not feel that the architectural training of himself and the Director of Planning should be completely ignored; and he assured the Commission that construction of the combined-use building being recommended in condition No. 3 of the draft resolution would be completely feasible. However, if the Commission wished to eliminate the requirement for the combined-use facility, he would be willing to recommend that the subject application be approved subject to restrictions concerning the removal of the existing parking spaces and subject to a proviso requiring future amendment of the Master Plan of the University of San Francisco to reflect construction of a new parking garage to meet the needs of the campus.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that it would be best for the Commission to take the matter under advisement so that the matter could be given further consideration by the Staff of the Department of City Planning, the applicants, and the Zoning Committee of the Commission.

September 3, 1970

Father McDonald stated that he would not object to having the matter taken under advisement until the meeting of October 1, 1970.

Commissioner Finn requested the staff of the Department of City Planning to confer further with the residence of the subject neighborhood, also, during the interim period.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to take the subject application under advisement until the meeting of October 1, 1970.

CU70.83 - 625 - 665 Monterey Blvd., south line, 100 feet west of Foerster Street.

Request for a parking lot in conjunction with a new Safeway Store; in an C-1 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant Safeway Stores Inc., had proposed to construct a new store to replace a store existing on a portion of the subject property. In addition, the applicant proposed to construct 73 off-street parking spaces consisting of 42 spaces at grade along side the proposed store and 31 spaces on the roof of the proposed store. The conditional use application had been filed because the 73 parking spaces would exceed in number the 36 off-street parking spaces required by the City Planning Code; and, therefore, the additional parking spaces could be permitted in a C-1 district only if authorized as a conditional use.

Phil Davidson, representing Safeway Stores Inc., stated that the store presently occupying the site had been designed in 1940; and he indicated that his firm wished to demolish the store and to replace it with a modern facility. He indicated that both the architect for the new store and the manager of the store were present in the audience to answer any questions which might be raised by the members of the Commission.

Mrs. William J. Mahoney, owner of property adjacent to the subject site on the south, complained about garbage accumulation on the site of the present store and asked if the situation would be remedied when the new store is constructed. Mr. Ludwig, architect for the applicant, described the plot-plan which he had prepared for the new store and indicated that all garbage would be stored inside the new building.

Mrs. Mahoney and two other residents of the subject neighborhood who were present in the audience stated that they had not received notices of the present hearing and would have been unaware of the proposal if they had not seen a notice posted on a telephone pole. Mr. Steele replied that notices had been mailed as required; and he did not know why they had not been received. However, since such situations are apt to occur, the staff of the

1950-1951

The following information was obtained from the meeting of October 1

September 3, 1970

Department of City Planning has made a practice of posting notices of scheduled hearings on telephone poles in the neighborhoods involved even though such posting is not legally required; and it was obvious that the posted notices had alerted residents of the neighborhood to the hearing.

After further discussion, Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to five conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. Before distributing the draft resolution, he recommended that a sixth condition be added requiring that the proposed parking lot be closed by a chain or by a gate whenever the store is not open to the public. After summarizing and commenting on the conditions being proposed, he recommended that the draft resolution, as amended, be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

Mr. Davison stated that he did not object to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6622 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution, as amended.

CU70.82 - 211 Main Street, southeast corner of Howard Street.

Request for a 165 car parking garage within an office building addition to the existing Folger Bldg.; in a C-3-S District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicants proposed to provide a 165 car parking garage on two below grade levels in conjunction with the construction of a proposed 17 story office building addition to the existing Folger Building. The proposed parking area would represent 8.1% of the gross floor area of the existing Folger Building and of the proposed addition where a maximum of 7% would be permitted without conditional use approval. The 1.1% additional floor space would add approximately 20 cars to the capacity of the garage; and both the entrance and exit to the garage would be located on Spear Street.

William Blackwell, representing the applicant, stated that additional parking spaces are already needed in the subject neighborhood; and he remarked that construction of the new addition to the Folger Building would increase the demand for parking in the area. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the subject application would be approved.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the subject application.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
ON THE
CENSUS OF 1900
PART I
GENERAL INFORMATION
CHAPTER I
THE CENSUS OF 1900
SECTION I
THE CENSUS OF 1900
SUBSECTION I
THE CENSUS OF 1900

beavor

Mr. Taylor stated that he had not signed the "Declaration of Principles" of the NAACP.

After the interview it was found by the interviewee that the first case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The second case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The third case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The fourth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The fifth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The sixth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The seventh case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The eighth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The ninth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party. The tenth case was a case of a person who had been in the United States for a long time and was a member of the Communist Party.

1. The first of these is the fact that the
2. second of these is the fact that the
3. third of these is the fact that the
4. fourth of these is the fact that the
5. fifth of these is the fact that the

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United States regarding the results of its investigation of the activities of the American Friends Service Committee in the Philippines. The Commission is therefore unable to determine whether the activities of the American Friends Service Committee in the Philippines are consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of the Manila Conference.

With a small reputation the speaker, who was a well-known author and writer, was the subject of a book by the author of the book. The book was published in the year 1910, and the author of the book was the author of the book.

September 3, 1970

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to four specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Corwin Booth, owner of the subject property, stated that the conditions appeared to him to be satisfactory.

Mr. Blackwell asked if condition No. 1 of the draft resolution would require that both of the off-street loading spaces to be provided for the office building should be located within the garage structure. He stated that the plans presently called for one of the loading spaces to be within the building and other to be located outside of the building. Mr. Steele replied that it would be desirable to have both of the loading spaces located within the building; however, if such a solution should not prove to be feasible, the draft resolution would allow one of the loading spaces to be located outside of the building.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6623 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CU70.85 - 4th Street, east line, south of Channel Street.

Request for a temporary landing facility for helicopters;
in an M-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicants had requested permission to construct a triangular-shaped helicopter pad on the subject site approximately 70 feet east of 4th Street and 130 feet south of Channel Street. The heli-pad would be used four evenings per week, Monday thru Thursday, at 7:00 P.M. for delivery of bank data. Helicopters would approach the site from east-to-west, i.e., from the bay inland along the channel, to avoid buildings and populated areas. Shortly before reaching the 4th Street Bridge, the helicopters would make a 180 degree turn to land on the heli-pad.

Ed Carr, general manager of Waters Helicopters Inc., the applicant, stated that he had previously distributed brochures to members of the Commission to describe the type of activity which would take place on the subject site. He stated that since the heli-port at the Ferry Building had been closed, the sole remaining heli-port in the city is located on top of the Bank of America Building at Market Street and So. Van Ness Avenue. The proposed facility, as initially conceived, would serve the needs of the Wells Fargo Bank.

The first of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The second of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The third of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The fourth of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The fifth of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The sixth of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

The seventh of these is the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform. The rate of tax varies from 10% to 20% in different parts of the country. This is due to the fact that the system of taxation is not uniform.

September 3, 1970

Commissioner Finn asked about the type of helicopter which would use the proposed facility. Mr. Carr replied that his firm uses Bell-Jet-Ranger Helicopters, Model 206-A. He stated that those helicopters are extremely quiet and efficient; and he assured the Commission that the noise level which they would produce would be less than that produced by the average large truck.

President Newman, noting that the brochure which had been distributed to members of the Commission had contained a copy of a letter from the F.A.A. indicating that aero-nautical studies of the proposal had not yet been completed, asked if any problems were anticipated in obtaining the approval of the F.A.A., Mr. Carr replied that he had taken representatives of both the F.A.A. and the State of California on flights earlier in the day; and they had seemed to be satisfied with the proposal.

Commissioner Newman then asked if the site could be used as a heli-port without approval from the F.A.A. Mr. Carr replied in the negative.

The Secretary called attention to a note which he had received from Elaine Sundahl, representative of the Potrero Hill Residents and Homeowners Council, objecting to use of the subject site as a temporary landing facility for helicopters. Mrs. Sundahl noted that the residents of Potrero Hill are subjected to constant noise from commercial helicopters serving the airport and from helicopters operated by the police; and, in addition, a great deal of noise is created by vehicles on the two freeways on either side of Potrero Hill and by the Southern Pacific trains. Under the circumstances, she felt that approval of the subject application would not be desirable.

Commissioner Finn asked if the subject site had previously been considered as a possible location for a STOL-port. Mr. Steele replied in the affirmative and indicated that a decision had been made that the site would not be appropriate for that use.

President Newman asked if the applicant intended to expand his operations on the subject site in the future. Mr. Carr replied in the affirmative but indicated that no definite plans had been except to provide service for the Wells Fargo Bank.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to three specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

Mr. Carr stated that the conditions contained in the draft resolution, including condition No. 3 which specified that the proposed use of the subject site should be subject to annual review by the Department of City Planning, were acceptable to him.

September 3, 1970

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6624 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions in the draft resolution.

ZM70.28 - Hunters Point Naval Ship Yard bounded on the south by Bancroft Avenue, on the west by Fitch Street, Palou Avenue, Griffith Street, McKinnon Avenue, Kirkwood Avenue, and Earl Street, and on the East by the Pier Head Line.
M-2 to a P (Public Use) District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the application for reclassification of the subject property from M-2 to P had been initiated by the City Planning Commission in accordance with its policy of classifying all lands in public ownership and use within the P district. He indicated that reclassification of the subject property to P would be consistent with current land use in the area as well as with policies and proposals of the south Bayshore amendment to the Master Plan of the City.

No one was present in the audience to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6625 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

1. The purpose of this document is to provide information regarding the activities of the [redacted] organization. This information is being provided for your information and is not to be used for any other purpose.

2. The information contained herein is classified as [redacted] and is being provided to you under the provisions of the [redacted] Act. It is to be kept confidential and not to be released to the public.

3. The information contained herein is being provided to you for your information only. It is not to be used for any other purpose. The information is being provided to you in confidence and is to be kept confidential.

4. The information contained herein is being provided to you for your information only. It is not to be used for any other purpose. The information is being provided to you in confidence and is to be kept confidential.

5. The information contained herein is being provided to you for your information only. It is not to be used for any other purpose. The information is being provided to you in confidence and is to be kept confidential.

Very truly yours,
[redacted]

[redacted]

100-100000-1
Page 1

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 10, 1970.

The City Planning Committee met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 10, 1970, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector B. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Dennis Ryan, Planner III - Urban Design; William Duchek, Planner II - Urban Design; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II - Urban Design; Joan Lampier, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of August 6 and 20, 1970, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

President Newman introduced Hector B. Rueda, who had been sworn in by Mayor Joseph L. Alioto as a member of the City Planning Commission earlier in the day.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reminded the Commission of a special meeting which has been scheduled for next Monday evening, September 14, at 7:30 p.m. in the Auditorium of Balboa High School. The subject of the meeting will be the Improvement Plan for Residence.

The Director advised the Commission that the staff, which has met with a number of civic groups to discuss the Improvement Plan for Residence, will be meeting with the Council for Civic Unity, the Housing Task Force, and the Human Rights Commission during the next week.

The Director announced that the San Francisco Foundation had approved a grant of \$10,000 to provide part of the local funds required for a HUD grant to do comprehensive planning for housing and recreation in Chinatown.

President Newman announced the appointment of a 19-member Citizens Advisory Committee to assist the Department of City Planning in the special planning project for Chinatown which will be directed at immediate improvements in housing and recreation. He stated that the Committee will hold an organizational meeting in the near future; and, subsequently, the Chinatown project will be initiated with full force in October.

9/10/70

Review of final plans for Mount Sutro Television Transmitter Tower in accordance with conditions established by Resolution No. 5967.

Robert Passmore, Planner V- Zoning, remarked that the Commission, acting in 1966, had approved a conditional use application for a TV tower and transmitter station to be located on Mount Sutro; and the resolution which was adopted at that time had contained a condition requiring that final plans be submitted to the Commission for review and approval. He displayed renderings which had been submitted of the proposed tower and transmission building and indicated that both the transmission building and the tower, which would have a height of 977 feet, were substantially the same as those which had been proposed in the preliminary plans which had been reviewed and approved by the Commission in 1966.

The Director, noting that the proposed project had been approved by the Commission prior to his appointment as Director of Planning, stated that he could not recommend that the project be built; however, he advised the Commission that the final plans which had been presented were in conformity with the requirements previously established by the Commission in approving the project.

Commissioner Ritchie, remarking that the plans would require the demolition of the old Sutro Mansion, asked if that building had been designated as a Landmark. Mr. Passmore replied that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board had considered the building; but they had not recommended that it be designated as a Landmark.

Robert Raymer, attorney for Sutro Tower, Inc., advised the Commission that a number of architects and engineers involved in the project were present in the audience to respond to any questions which might be raised by the members of the Commission.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the proposed tower would be incredibly prominent; and he asked if anything could be done to make the tower more appealing to the eye. Mr. Raymer replied that there had been only two possible locations for the proposed tower, one being the subject site and the other being Mount San Bruno; however, following ten years of litigation, the Mount San Bruno site had been determined to be undesirable because of hazards to air navigation. While the proposed tower would be a large structure, he assured the Commission that everything possible had been done to make it sightly, including the obtaining of a waiver from the F.A.A. for a less obtrusive striping pattern.

Mr. Winkler, an engineer for the applicants, remarked that there is a limit to what can be done with a tower of the magnitude of the one being proposed. He felt that the fact that the F.A.A. had approved a waiver allowing the width of the red and white stripes to be reduced would make the tower more attractive; and he believed that people would not even notice the tower once it has been constructed.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the proposed project would leave a great deal of open space on the site; and she noted that residence of the subject neighborhood had indicated that they were not anxious to have the property developed with row-houses.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The first part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the discovery of the continent by Christopher Columbus in 1492 to the establishment of the first permanent settlements. This period is characterized by the exploration of the continent by Spanish, French, and English explorers, and the establishment of the first permanent settlements by the English in 1607.

The second part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the establishment of the first permanent settlements to the American Revolution in 1776. This period is characterized by the growth of the colonies, the struggle for independence from Britain, and the establishment of the United States as a new nation.

The third part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the American Revolution to the Civil War in 1861. This period is characterized by the expansion of the United States, the struggle for slavery, and the establishment of the United States as a major power in the world.

The fourth part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the Civil War to the present. This period is characterized by the Reconstruction era, the Gilded Age, the Progressive Era, and the modern era.

The fifth part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the present to the future. This period is characterized by the challenges of the future, such as climate change, nuclear war, and the rise of artificial intelligence.

The sixth part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the future to the end of time. This period is characterized by the ultimate fate of the United States and the world.

The seventh part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the end of time to the beginning of time. This period is characterized by the beginning of the universe and the birth of life.

The eighth part of the history of the United States of America is the period from the beginning of time to the present. This period is characterized by the history of the United States and the world.

9/10/70

President Newman asked if the proposed facility would be available to any radio or television stations which might wish to use it. Mr. Raymer replied in the affirmative and indicated that the Federal Government had included a condition to that effect in giving authorization for construction of the tower.

President Newman asked if it would then be safe to assume that San Francisco would never need additional towers of the sort being proposed if the project under consideration were to be constructed. Mr. Raymer replied that the F.A.A. wishes to avoid the construction of more than one such structure in any single metropolitan area.

Marian Bernstein, member of the Twin Peaks Association and a property owner on Palo Alto Avenue, stated that the applicants had worked very co-operatively with residents of the neighborhood; however, she noted that the plans which had been submitted called for use of one gallon-sized plants for landscaping; and, since such landscaping would require at least ten years to become effective, she felt that full-scale landscaping should be installed at the outset. She also remarked that residents of the neighborhood had been led to believe that trees to be removed from the site would be carefully considered so that the area would not be denuded; and she hoped that the Commission would establish a condition to that effect.

Harry Jacobson, Director of the proposed project, stated that only three or four large trees would be removed in the vicinity of the proposed tower; and he assured the Commission that there will be as many trees on the site upon completion of the project as there are at present, although some may be located differently on the site. No trees would have to be removed to accommodate the proposed transmission building. He advised the Commission that permission had been obtained from the Water Department to landscape the City-owned property adjacent to the subject site. In conclusion, he stated that Mrs. Bernstein's suggestions about larger plant materials would be given consideration.

Commissioner Porter felt that plants of five gallon-size would be better than the one gallon variety.

Mr. Hanson, representing the architects of the proposed transmission building, stated that the area to be landscaped is surrounded by a forest; and, under the circumstances, he did not feel that the landscaping would be seen by the community for a number of years, in any case. Plants of one gallon-size had been recommended as they would take root easier and would stand the wind better than plants from five gallon cans; however, further consideration could be given to the matter.

Commissioner Finn asked what type of planting materials would be used on the site. Mr. Hanson replied that Eucalyptus, Monterey Cypress, Redwoods and other types of trees were being proposed.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Mellon that the plans be approved as in conformity with the conditions previously established by Resolution No. 5967.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

THESE ARE THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCHES OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN THE YEAR 1871-72. THE RESULTS OF THE
RESEARCHES OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE IN THE YEAR 1871-72.

9/10/70

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the proposed tower would be too high and too unattractive; and, since the Director had indicated that he could not recommend construction of the tower, he intended to vote against the motion.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the City Planning Commission is a continuing body; and she felt that its members should have a responsibility for maintaining continuity with actions taken by previous Commissioners.

Commissioner Finn remarked that the San Francisco Airport had opposed the San Bruno site; and because of the action of the F.A.A., the subject site had been established as the only possible site for construction of the proposed facility. He also indicated that technical considerations limit the extent to which it is possible to beautify such a structure. Under the circumstances, he intended to vote for approval of the plans.

Mr. Raymer remarked that the joint venture had spent several hundred thousand dollars for studies and plans based on the Commission's previous approval of the conditional use application for the project; and he felt that disapproval of the plans by the Commission at the present time would be grossly unfair.

When the question was called, the Commission voted 6 - 1 to approve the subject plans as being in conformity with the conditions established by Resolution No. 5967. Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, Mellon, Newman, Porter, and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

R70,58 - Installation of underground electrical conduit on
City Property between Twin Peaks Boulevard and
Crestline Drive.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referral has been received from the Director of Property.

"Pacific Gas and Electric Company is in the process of increasing the power supply to the television transmitter on Mount Sutro from 4 to 12 kilovolts. Two new lines will be installed, providing alternate sources of power: one, the southerly route, through the Vista Francisco development up to Twin Peaks Boulevard via City lands below the Peaks and thence through Midtown Terrace; and the northerly route from Graystone Terrace by way of Twin Peaks Boulevard, Mountain Spring Avenue, Glenbrook Avenue and Palo Alto Avenue. Where undergrounding already exists, the lines will be undergrounded, and elsewhere they will be on existing poles. There will be a new section of undergrounding on the southerly route in Vista Francisco, between Burnett Avenue and Parkridge Drive, replacing an overhead route.

The first of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The second of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The third of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The fourth of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The fifth of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The sixth of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The seventh of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The eighth of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

The ninth of these is the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the necessary cooperation from the United States Government in the matter of the proposed British loan to the United States Government.

9/10/70

"On the overhead portion of the southern route along Marview Way and Farview Court, there are now 4 lines which will be reduced to 3 in conjunction with the new installation. Three poles on the southern route will have to be increased in height; the increases will be on the order of 10 or 15 feet.

"P.C.&E. has requested permission to cross approximately 150 feet of City property below the north peak between Twin Peaks Boulevard and Crestline Drive with underground line. This is a prominent and visible location and P.C.&E. is willing to guarantee to leave no permanent scars on the hillside, use hand digging only, select the actual location of the ditch to minimize disturbance and return the land to as near the original condition as possible."

The Director recommended that installation of the underground electrical conduit on City property be approved provided that the natural appearance of the area is restored as nearly as possible to its previous condition so that there will be no permanent scarring of the Twin Peaks hillside.

Marian Bernstein, a property owner of Palo Alto Avenue, asked if the proposed project would affect the existing overhead line which runs from Palo Alto Avenue to the Reservoir. Mr. Jung replied that he had been advised that the line in question would be removed.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the installation of the underground electrical conduit on City property between Twin Peaks Boulevard and Crestline Drive is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the natural appearance of the area is restored as nearly as possible to its previous condition so that there is no permanent scarring of the Twin Peaks hillside.

At 2:55 p.m. President Newman announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

Public Hearing for reconsideration of height limits previously recommended by the City Planning Commission for the area bounded by the Ferry Building, The Embarcadero, the Bay Bridge and the Pier Head Line.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on this matter as follows:

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

On 10/10/50, the following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

Very truly yours,

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, dated 10/10/50, and is being furnished to you for your information.

9/10/70

"THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING IS TO RECONSIDER, AT THE REQUEST OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, YOUR PREVIOUS ACTION RECOMMENDING CERTAIN HEIGHT LIMITS SOUTH OF THE FERRY BUILDING. THE QUESTION BEFORE YOU, THE ONLY QUESTION, IS THE APPROPRIATENESS OF A HEIGHT LIMIT IN THIS AREA. I FULLY REALIZE THAT TO IGNORE PROPOSALS WHICH HAVE UNOFFICIALLY COME BEFORE YOU IS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT. HOWEVER, IF THE PLANNING PROCESS IS TO REALLY MEAN SOMETHING, PARTICULARLY IN AN AREA WHERE NEW DEVELOPMENT IS EXPECTED, A RATIONAL APPROACH TO THE SITUATION MUST BE OBSERVED. IN THIS CASE, YOU SHOULD DETERMINE WHAT FORM OF DEVELOPMENT IS APPROPRIATE IN THIS AREA, AND THEN TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS LEGISLATION RESPONSIVE TO THE DETERMINATION.

"THE REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION WAS BASED, AT LEAST IN PART, UPON THE PORT COMMISSION'S DESIRE TO HAVE GREATER DEVELOPMENT, IN TERMS OF HEIGHT AND EXTENT OF HIGH DEVELOPMENT, THAN WOULD BE PERMITTED UNDER THE LIMITATIONS PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THIS COMMISSION. THE PORT HAS MAINTAINED THAT TO HAVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, MORE DEVELOPMENT IS NECESSARY. THE PORT WISHES TO RECEIVE THE GREATEST POSSIBLE MONETARY RETURN ON ANY DEVELOPMENT IN THIS AREA, AND OF COURSE, THE LARGER THE DEVELOPMENT THE GREATER THE RETURN. THEY WANT, ALSO, TO HAVE A PASSENGER TERMINAL IN THIS AREA. HOWEVER, IT MUST BE OBSERVED THAT WHERE MORE DEVELOPMENT IS DESIRED, INFLATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM VIRTUALLY DICTATES AN INCREASE IN BUILDING BULK AND USUALLY A GREATER HEIGHT THOUGH THIS IS INFLUENCED MORE BY A PARTICULAR DESIGN CONCEPT THAN THE PROGRAM, PER SE. THE MONETARY RETURN TO THE PORT IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF A PROJECT.

"IF I MAY DIGRESS FOR A MOMENT, THE REQUIREMENT THAT A NEW PASSENGER SHIP TERMINAL BE INCLUDED IN ANY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN THIS AREA SEEMS QUESTIONABLE TO THE STAFF. INCLUSION OF A TERMINAL CERTAINLY MEANS LESS RETURN TO THE PORT AND IN ADDITION, THE UNPRODUCTIVE SPACE MUST BE BALANCED BY SIZABLE INCREASES IN REVENUE - PRODUCTIVE SPACE WHICH FURTHER INFLATES THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR ANY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. THIS CLEARLY WAS WHY THE ECONOMIC CONSULTANT TO THE PORT, THE A. D. LITTLE COMPANY, RECOMMENDED RETENTION OF THE EXISTING TERMINAL AT PIER 35, WITH MODERNIZATION, RATHER THAN A NEW FACILITY. THERE IS NOT, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, ANY FINANCIAL JUSTIFICATION FOR A NEW TERMINAL REQUIREMENT.

"IN PASSING, I WOULD ALSO OBSERVE THAT OTHER PROBLEMS MAY ARISE WITH RESPECT TO A TERMINAL AT THIS LOCATION, DEPENDING UPON THE FINAL DESIGN OF ANY PLATFORM OR FILL. WE HAVE BEEN INFORMALLY ADVISED THAT PASSENGER SHIP HANDLING PROBLEMS, IN ADDITION TO SILTING PROBLEMS, MAY WELL PROVE TO BE DIFFICULT IN THE AREA SOUTH OF THE FERRY BUILDING.

9/10/70

"RETURNING TO THE HEIGHT LIMIT QUESTION, THE STAFF HAS PREPARED A SHORT ANALYSIS OF THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONS AS WELL AS EFFECTS VARIOUS DEVELOPMENT FORMS COULD HAVE. THIS ANALYSIS CAN BE SHOWN BEST BY A GRAPHIC PRESENTATION. (From this point on, photographic slides were used to illustrate the remarks being made by the Director).

"THE AREA UNDER CONSIDERATION IS A PART OF THE FERRY BUILDING AREA VARIABLE SPECIAL HEIGHT DISTRICT. THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HAS ENACTED YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE AREA MARKED 65 FEET AND THOSE PORTIONS MARKED A AND B. FROM HOWARD STREET SOUTH, WHERE THE COMMISSION PREVIOUSLY RECOMMENDED A BASE HEIGHT LIMIT OF 84 FEET, EXCEPT FOR THE DARKER AREA WHERE 400 FEET WOULD BE PERMITTED, IS THE AREA FOR WHICH THE BOARD HAS ASKED RECONSIDERATION. NO HEIGHT LIMIT PRESENTLY EXISTS IN THIS AREA.

"I WOULD ALSO CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO THE PRESENT ZONING IN THE AREA. THE SITE IS ZONED C-2; INLAND. DISTRICTS ARE C-3-S AND M-1. CONTRARY TO GENERAL UNDERSTANDING, HIGH BUILDINGS ARE NOT, IN FACT, LIKELY TO BE DEVELOPED INLAND IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY OF THE SITE. THEORETICALLY, HIGH BUILDINGS COULD BE DEVELOPED, BUT THE FREEWAY PATTERN, BOTH EXISTING AND PROPOSED, TOGETHER WITH THE PATTERNS OF LAND OWNERSHIP AND ZONING, VIRTUALLY RULE OUT VERY HIGH BUILDINGS. THIS WAS CONSIDERED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT PLAN. ONE OF THE FIRST DETERMINATIONS BY THE DESIGN CONSULTANTS, JOHN BOLLES AND ASSOCIATES, WAS THAT THE AREA ADJACENT TO THE FERRY BUILDING WAS BEST SUITED TO DEVELOPMENT OF LOW INTENSITY, SMALL SCALE AND LOW HEIGHT, TO PROVIDE A CHANGE OF CHARACTER AND CONTRAST TO THE DOWNTOWN AREA TO THE WEST. THE DOWNTOWN AREA IS WELL KNOWN FOR ITS COMPACT, HIGH INTENSITY DEVELOPMENT AND DISTINCTIVE FORM. THE SITE IS NOT ONLY WELL REMOVED BUT DEVELOPMENT INLAND IS FAR DIFFERENT IN CHARACTER FROM THE DOWNTOWN AREA: DEVELOPMENT IS GENERALLY SMALL IN SCALE, LOW IN INTENSITY AND LOW IN HEIGHT.

"THE C-2 DISTRICT WAS RECOMMENDED FOR THE WATERFRONT PROPERTY PARTIALLY TO EMPHASIZE THIS CHANGE OF CHARACTER AND INTENSITY OF USE WHICH IS APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE LOCATION EAST OF THE EMBARCADERO. IN ADDITION TO THE BASIC ZONING, THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NUMBER 1 OVERLAYS ALL OF THE AREA ON THE BAY SIDE OF THE EMBARCADERO FROM THE BRIDGE TO FISHERMAN'S WHARF. THIS SPECIAL USE DISTRICT REQUIRES CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION FOR ALL NON-PORT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT. THE EXTENT OF THE FREEWAYS DIRECTLY INLAND FROM THE AREA UNDER CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE NOTED.

"IT IS QUITE CLEAR THAT THE SITE ENJOYS PROMINENCE LOCATED AS IT IS BETWEEN THE FERRY BUILDING AND THE BAY BRIDGE EAST OF THE EMBARCADERO. IT IS ALSO QUITE CLEAR THAT THE SITE IS UNIQUE, AND, FROM AN URBAN DESIGN POINT OF VIEW, VERY SENSITIVE. GREAT CARE MUST BE EXERCISED IN DETERMINING WHAT FORM DEVELOPMENT SHOULD TAKE.

9/10/70

"THE LOCATION AND MASSING OF BUILDINGS PRESENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR PROPOSED FOR CONSTRUCTION IN THE NEAR FUTURE WILL ASSIST IN THE DISCUSSION OF BUILDING HEIGHTS IN NEARBY AREAS.

"FOR EXAMPLE, THE HIGH-RISE CENTRAL OFFICE DISTRICT IS WHERE NEARLY ALL OF OUR HIGHER BUILDINGS ARE LOCATED. THIS INTENSELY DEVELOPED AREA FORMS THE MOST IMPORTANT SKYLINE FORM OF THE DOWNTOWN AREA. IT IS THE HEART OF THE CITY.

"OTHER HIGH BUILDINGS, MAINLY HOTELS, HAVE A CONSIDERABLE IMPACT UPON THE FORM OF THE CITY. THE MAJOR CONCENTRATION OF THESE HOTEL TOWERS ARE LOCATED NORTH OF MARKET STREET.

"FURTHER WEST IS THE CIVIC CENTER COMPLEX WHERE ADDITIONAL LARGE BUILDINGS ARE EXPECTED, THOUGH NOT OF THE SCALE OF THE HOTEL TOWERS OR DOWNTOWN OFFICE BUILDINGS. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE HOTELS, THE MAJOR TALL BUILDINGS ARE, OR WILL BE LOCATED WITH AN ORIENTATION CONSISTENT WITH THE MAJOR MASS TRANSPORTATION ARTERY - MARKET STREET.

"THE UNDERGROUND BART AND MUNI WILL PLAY AN EVER INCREASING ROLE IN THE LOCATION OF MAJOR OFFICE STRUCTURES AS RAPID TRANSIT WILL BECOME A DOMINANT MEANS OF ACCESS FOR WORKERS IN OFFICES. THIS MAP FROM THE 1966 DOWNTOWN ZONING STUDY SHOWS THIS TRANSIT INFLUENCE AS A VERY IMPORTANT ELEMENT. THIS INFLUENCE IS NOW BEING FELT IN FACT AS WELL AS ANTICIPATION.

"WHILE SOME MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, THIS MAP SHOWS THE PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE MONTGOMERY AND DAVIS STREET STATIONS WHICH WAS THE BASIS OF THE ZONING PATTERN ADOPTED FOR THE DOWNTOWN AREA.

"IN ALL OF THESE ILLUSTRATIONS, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE DEVELOPMENT SITE SOUTH OF THE FERRY BUILDING IS WELL REMOVED FROM THOSE AREAS WHERE HIGH BUILDINGS, AND PARTICULARLY HIGH INTENSITY OFFICE BUILDINGS, WILL CONTINUE TO BE CONSTRUCTED, AND WHERE WE HAVE DESIRED HIGH INTENSITY - DOWNTOWN - USES TO BE CONSTRUCTED.

"ANOTHER FACTOR WHICH FURTHER SEPARATES THE DEVELOPMENT SITE FROM THE DOWNTOWN AREA IS THE FREEWAY SYSTEM, ESPECIALLY THE SOUTHERN AND EMBARCADERO FREEWAYS. THE UNDERGROUNDING OF THE EMBARCADERO FREEWAY AT THE FERRY BUILDING AND NORTH HAS BEEN ADVOCATED BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE MAYOR, TO RETURN THE FERRY BUILDING TO ITS FORMER PROMINENCE AS WELL AS TO ACHIEVE ACCESS TO THE WATERFRONT. TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, THE CONNECTION WITH THE SOUTHERN FREEWAY MUST BE MODIFIED TO BRING THE FREEWAY TO GRADE NEAR MISSION STREET IN ORDER TO BE BELOW GRADE AT MARKET STREET. SHOULD THIS UNDERGROUNDING OCCUR, ACCESS TO THE AREA SOUTH OF THE FERRY BUILDING WILL BE SEVERELY RESTRICTED. PROBABLY VEHICULAR ACCESS, WILL BE RESTRICTED TO FOLSOM AND HARRISON STREETS AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO

9/10/70

MARKET STREET, WITH A POSSIBLE PEDESTRIAN OVER-PASS AT MISSION STREET. HOWARD STREET WOULD BE COMPLETELY BLOCKED. WHILE DEVELOPMENT IS NOT PRECLUDED, THE TYPE AND INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT MAY WELL BE AFFECTED.

"IN MY MEMO TO YOU LAST NOVEMBER ON THE QUESTION OF HEIGHT LIMITS IN THE ENTIRE FERRY BUILDING AREA, I MENTIONED THAT THE BAY BRIDGE WAS A VERY IMPORTANT VISUAL ELEMENT; ONE WHICH SHOULD BE CONTINUED AS A SEPARATE FORM TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE. AT THE PRESENT TIME THE BRIDGE MAY BE SEEN FROM NEARLY ALL OF THE HIGHER ELEVATIONS FROM MARKET STREET SOUTH, ROUGHLY HALF THE CITY.

"FOR EXAMPLE, THE BRIDGE, COMPLETELY SEPARATED FROM DOWNTOWN CAN BE SEEN FROM DIAMOND HEIGHTS NEAR PORTOLA DRIVE, FROM THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF DIAMOND HEIGHTS, FROM DOLORES HEIGHTS, MISSION PARK, BERNAL HEIGHTS, POTRERO HILL AND MANY OTHER AREAS IN THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE CITY. THE BRIDGE IS ALSO A MAJOR VISUAL-ELEMENT FROM TELEGRAPH HILL AND COIT TOWER. WHILE THE BRIDGE CAN BE SEEN AS A DISTINCT, SEPARATE ENTITY, PERHAPS MORE IMPORTANT IS THE SEPARATION OF THE HIGH-RISE DOWNTOWN BUILDINGS FROM THE BRIDGE WHICH GIVES ADDED EMPHASIS TO BOTH. HIGH BUILDINGS BETWEEN THE TWO WOULD REDUCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF BOTH THE DOWNTOWN SKYLINE AND THE BAY BRIDGE.

"THIS VIEW FROM MISSION PARK, WHICH IS REALLY A FAIRLY LOW ELEVATION, CLEARLY ILLUSTRATES HOW A HIGH BUILDING, OF EITHER 400 OR 550 FEET IN HEIGHT, WOULD DISRUPT THIS FORM. IT IS ALSO CLEAR THAT THE LIMITATION TO 175' WITH AN 84-FOOT BASE WOULD CAUSE ESSENTIALLY NO VISUAL DISRUPTION AND WOULD THEREFORE PRESERVE THIS FORM.

"FROM YERBA BUENA ISLAND, IT CAN BE SEEN THAT HEIGHTS OF EITHER 84 or 175 FEET WOULD BLEND WITH THE REMAINDER OF THE CITY, BUT IN CONTRAST, BUILDINGS 400 or 550 FEET TALL WOULD SEVERELY INTRUDE INTO THE SKYLINE TO THE DETRIMENT OF BOTH DOWNTOWN AND THE BRIDGE.

"FROM THE JAMES LICK FREEWAY, AS ONE FIRST SEES DOWNTOWN, THE PRESENT SEPARATION IS CLEAR. EVEN A BUILDING 175 FEET TALL WOULD NOT BE VISUALLY IMPORTANT, HOWEVER - A BUILDING 400 FEET HIGH OR ONE OF 550 FEET BECOMES HIGHLY INTRUSIVE.

"I COULD GO ON FOR SOMETIME DISCUSSING HOW HIGH BUILDING IN THIS PARTICULAR AREA WOULD AFFECT VIEW OF DOWNTOWN FROM THE BRIDGE, THE VISUAL ANNIHILATION OF THE FERRY BUILDING TOWER AND THE FORM OF THE BAY BRIDGE AS VIEWED FROM THE PRESENT EMBARCADERO FREEWAY OR THE FUTURE MARITIME PARKWAY, AND SO ON. HOWEVER, I FEEL MY POINT WITH RESPECT TO HIGH DEVELOPMENT AT THIS LOCATION HAS BEEN MADE. I COULD GO ON, TOO, REGARDING THE PROPRIETY OR IMPROPRIETY OF DENSE DOWNTOWN USES AT THIS LOCATION.

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

THEY WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS
 WHO WERE NOT THE ONLY ONES WHO WERE
 IN THE HOUSE. THERE WERE OTHERS

9/10/70

"I WOULD MAKE ONE FURTHER OBSERVATION AT THIS POINT. IT IS, SIMPLY, THAT NO DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL HAS YET BEEN RECEIVED FOR YOUR REVIEW AS REQUIRED FOR NON-PORT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SPECIAL USE DISTRICT. YOU HAVE SEEN TWO POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT IN THIS AREA AND, FROM THE DIVERGENCE BETWEEN THOSE TWO, IT IS CLEAR THAT ALMOST ANYTHING IS POSSIBLE. I WOULD ALSO CAUTION YOU TO OBSERVE HOW PROPOSALS DO CHANGE FROM INITIAL CONCEPT TO FINAL DESIGN. CHANGE, BOTH IN OVERALL DESIGN AND IN DETAIL, ARE CERTAINLY TO BE EXPECTED. IT IS BECAUSE OF SUCH CHANGES THAT THE CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL OF SUCH PROJECTS WAS RECOMMENDED FOR THE NORTHERN WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT. THE STAFF CAN THEN WORK WITH THE DEVELOPERS TO ASSIST IN ACHIEVING THE BEST POSSIBLE SOLUTION TO ALL OF THE PROBLEMS WHICH ARISE, TO THE BENEFIT OF THE DEVELOPER AND, MORE IMPORTANT, TO SAN FRANCISCO.

"FOR ALL OF THESE REASONS, I MUST ONCE AGAIN RECOMMEND THAT THE HEIGHT OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA EAST OF THE EMBARCADERO BETWEEN THE FERRY BUILDING AND THE BAY BRIDGE BE LIMITED AS FOLLOWS: A BASIC 84-FOOT LIMIT WITH EXCEPTIONS PERMITTED TO A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 175 FEET FOR 10 PERCENT OF A PROJECT AREA, OR AN EQUIVALENT EXCEPTION TO A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 175 FEET BASED UPON A VOLUME COMPUTATION. THIS LATTER EXCEPTION WOULD BE SIMILAR TO THAT ENACTED FOR THE AREA NORTH OF THE FERRY BUILDING IN ORDER TO PERMIT FLEXIBILITY IN DEVELOPMENT FORM. A DRAFT RESOLUTION EMBODYING THIS RECOMMENDATION IS NOW BEING PLACED BEFORE YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION."

Miriam Wolfe, Director of the Port Commission, made the following statement:

"To give as clear a picture as possible of the Port's objectives and plans for this project, I would like to review briefly some recent Port history.

"In 1968, when the Port of San Francisco was transferred from state to city jurisdiction, it was incumbent on our Commission to assume some specific obligations.

"The Port Transfer Act specifically requires the city to issue 100 million dollars in bonds for Port improvement within 25 years of the date of transfer. Some 50 million dollars in bonds must be issued within the first 10 years. Failure to abide by these stipulations would cause the Port to revert to state jurisdiction.

"Happily, bond commitments and investments far exceeding this amount are comprehended in what the Port Commission considers necessary for thoughtful, productive renewal and development of waterfront areas and facilities in the best interest of the people of San Francisco.

9/10/70

"It was also clearly understood by commission members that operation, redevelopment and growth of the Port must be conducted on an economically self-sustaining basis without penalty or pain to San Francisco taxpayers.

"At the time of Port transfer, we were faced, too, with the fact that technological obsolescence had overtaken many of our maritime facilities. It has been necessary to phase out these facilities as rapidly as possible.

"It was also evident then that, unless many of the rapidly deteriorating docks and facilities were replaced or revitalized, they could prove a blight on the city and a drain on its resources.

"On the other hand, it was clear that certain waterfront properties under Port jurisdiction were available for creative income-producing development.

"It fell to the Port Commission to seek the most productive, constructive use of these resources.

"The Commission has for sometime considered the construction of a passenger ship terminal and maritime center an important element in Port rejuvenation. Such a facility could become the focal point for San Francisco maritime activity. It would capitalize on the city's prized role as the gateway to the Pacific; encourage growth of trade and commerce through the Port; stimulate the rebirth of trans-bay water transportation; provide a place for the people of San Francisco to experience and enjoy firsthand the excitement of maritime activity.

"The most appropriate place for such a maritime center is, we believe, the waterfront area between the Ferry Building and the Bay Bridge. This is the site:

At the midpoint along the Embarcadero between the active piers to the south and new waterfront development north of the Ferry Building; close to downtown and BART; immediately accessible from the Bay Bridge and the downtown business district; ideally situated to offer water transport to all parts of the Bay Area; removed from the more sensitive areas north of Market Street and the Ferry Building; positioned at a point where the shoreline changes direction, affording vistas of the bay at ground level and inviting striking architectural treatment of terminal center construction.

9/10/70

The site now is characterized by deteriorating dock facilities; virtually no public access to the waterfront; a clutter of old buildings and piers which discourage public use and invite the sicknesses of urban decline; no opportunity for people to enjoy views, vistas or the romance of maritime activity.

"Transforming the waterfront site between piers 14 to 24 -- from today's bleak realities to tomorrow's promise of a maritime center which San Franciscans can be proud of -- involves the most thoughtful planning in terms of certain economic needs. This is where the Port Commission seeks the understanding and support of the Planning Commission. We feel certain our goals are most compatible with yours.

"To establish a passenger ship terminal and related maritime facilities under conditions which will invite, rather than inhibit, public use and enjoyment of this section of the waterfront, will require a certain volume of commercial, revenue-producing space. It is needed to underwrite the passenger facility, plazas, promenades, parks and other elements which will make this project a public facility to be proud of. These elements, which we consider vital to waterfront development, are by no means self-sustaining. They demand resources and revenue from commercial development.

"As nearly as we can determine at this stage, about three million square feet of income-producing space will be required to support this project. These requirements can be met, we feel, through a moderate construction density or floor area ratio previously recommended by the Planning Commission.

"The question then becomes: How do we arrange this floor area to best advantage at this location?

"On the basis of lengthy and detailed investigation, the Port has determined that some tasteful, limited high-rise development is needed to interest responsible private developers and to meet the economic and aesthetic requirements for the best public use of the site. We believe concessions on height can and should provide the view corridors, open space and public accessibility appropriate to any development at this location.

"Frankly, we are far more interested in providing open space where people can come to the waterfront and enjoy it than in building to uniform heights.

"It always sounds like a charming idea to advocate low buildings. As a practical matter, however, low buildings can deprive everyone of the pleasures of daylight and views -- appropriating all of the space at ground level for solid walls of buildings and minimizing the usefulness of the land.

9/10/70

"We believe there are economic and pleasing sizes and shapes for buildings which are far more relevant than arbitrary height limits. For example, here is a model view of the Port's development proposal which imposes a maximum height limit of 550 feet. It is placed on a platform which provides berthing space for three passenger ships.

"Here is the same site, the same volume and density of construction, but at a height of 400 feet. The result is a bulkier office tower, less open space and only one major opening to the water.

"At 225 feet, the project becomes virtually a 1,000-foot long wall. There is, of course, far less plaza area as the buildings become squat and massive.

"At 175 feet, the wall increases to 1,500 feet in length, street level views to the water are obliterated and open space is almost non-existent.

"At 125 feet amenities cease to exist and project design becomes wholly unworkable and undesirable.

"The development plan which we would like to pursue provides for a multi-use project which will sustain a passenger ship terminal and other water-oriented facilities. The plan would embody commercial, office and hotel space totaling some three million square feet of floor area.

"We propose that it include one high-rise office tower of approximately 40 stories, a structure comparable in height to the Wells Fargo or Aetna Casualty buildings. Another major building on the site would be a hotel of approximately 1,000 rooms.

"We further propose that more than half of the platform area be open space accessible to the public. This park, plaza and promenade area -- totaling more than nine acres -- is denoted in green.

"Fortunately, this building site between piers 14 and 24 permits some high-rise construction without obstructing views from the hills of San Francisco.

"For example, here is a view from Telegraph Hill. Our proposed office tower is outlined on the left.

"This view from Russian Hill shows how well the office tower would blend into the downtown skyline. We have also indicated the location of Embarcadero Center's 60-story office building and 25-story hotel, which are already approved for construction.

9/10/70

"From the Bank of America Building, the structure appears as a natural extension of the downtown office core.

"Here it is shown as it would appear from the Top of the Mark.

"From Potrero Hill the tower adds to the profile of distant downtown buildings.

"We are concerned -- as I am sure you must be -- about the placement of buildings on the development site so that they afford as slim a profile as possible and do not interfere with view corridors. We are also vitally interested in creating open space and viewing areas at ground level.

"Our proposal for an office tower of no more than 550 feet is, in our judgment, the most reasonable way to preserve views and create new waterfront areas accessible to the public.

"There are today only three or four points along the Bay shoreline where San Franciscans can enjoy the water at street level. As a matter of fact, as you walk along the Embarcadero today between piers 14 and 24, there are views to the water along only 160 feet of this entire section of waterfront. Our plan would extend open views along the Embarcadero to 460 feet and would add more than half a mile of public access to the waterfront along the perimeter of the project.

"We are convinced that we can and should do all in our power to make Port lands and facilities open to the public. We wish to make maritime activity a firsthand experience for the people of San Francisco. Through this project we can generate a steady flow of passenger and cruise ship activity in full view of the public.

"We can open up for public enjoyment new water level views, a totally new experience of the Bay Bridge, and a varied exposure to the sights, pleasures, and activities of San Francisco Bay.

"Let me assure you that the Port Commission simply will not support, or become a party to, commercial development at this location that does not afford extensive plaza, promenade, and park areas stretching to the water's edge.

the following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the above mentioned documents.

1. The first name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

2. The second name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

3. The third name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

4. The fourth name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

5. The fifth name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

6. The sixth name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

7. The seventh name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

8. The eighth name is John Doe, who is the son of John Doe and Jane Doe.

9/10/70

"To accomplish this kind of sensitive and productive development of the site between piers 14 and 24, we ask the following:

A maximum height limit of 550 feet which will permit construction of a slim tower rather than bulky, obstructive buildings at lower levels.

Flexibility in the placement of taller buildings so that view corridors and open space are not obliterated.

"In January, the Planning Commission described an area 400 x 550 feet in which high-rise construction could occur. We ask that this area be extended to 700 feet by 850 feet in that portion of the site roughly between the lines of Howard and Folsom Streets.

"Please understand that, in requesting greater flexibility in the placement of taller buildings, we are not seeking greater density or volume of construction, or permission to build more buildings. We are simply asking some freedom in placing buildings to best advantage in terms of views, open space, and the engineering considerations of platform and passenger terminal construction.

"In making these requests, we give these assurances:

We will, for the first time, open this portion of the waterfront to general public use and enjoyment.

We will insist that public parks, plazas and walkways be incorporated into the project design.

We will seek to make this maritime development an international trade center in the full sense of the term, with all the concomitant economic, cultural and aesthetic benefits which can accrue to the people of San Francisco.

"There are others present here today who will, I am sure, speak directly to the subjects of tax, employment and trade and commerce benefits which will result from the development of the type of passenger terminal center I have described."

Commissioner Porter stated that she was not previously aware that the Port Commission was requesting expansion of the area in which high-rise construction would be allowed; and she asked if that issue had been discussed with the staff of the Department of City Planning. Miss Wolfe replied that the staff should have been aware of the proposal since expansion of the area in which high-rise construction would be permitted had been an objective of the Port Commission from the beginning. She stated that the larger area would be absolutely vital to the Port Commission since it would provide the flexibility needed by the architect to achieve a better design for the project; and, in fact, she had originally been

9/10/70

under the impression that the larger area being requested had been approved by the Commission when action was taken by the City Planning Commission on the high limit proposals in January, 1970. In any case, she emphasized that final plans for the proposed project would have to be brought before the City Planning Commission for approval before construction could be initiated.

Commissioner Ritchie noted that two high rise buildings would be constructed as part of the project being proposed by the Port Commission, an office building and a hotel; and, therefore, he was concerned about the request for expansion of the area in which high rise buildings could be located, a request which he had not been aware of previously. He asked the Director if the matter had been discussed with the staff. The Director replied that the staff had been aware that the Port Commission was requesting extension of the area in which high rise buildings would be permitted from 400 to 700 feet from the waterline. He noted, however, that the entire area denoted on a map which had been displayed by Miss Wolfe could not be acted on by the Commission at the present time since the area north of Howard Street extended had already been included in an 84-foot height limit district established by ordinance of the Board of Supervisors. Miss Wolfe stated that she had not been aware that the area north of the extension of Howard Street had been included in the 84-foot height limit district; however, she indicated that expansion of the high-rise district to a point 700 feet from the waterline between Howard and Folsom Streets would solve the Port Commission's problems, in part, since the buildings being proposed would be located within that area. Miss Wolfe then called on John Jacobs, Executive Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, to speak in behalf of the Port Commission's proposal.

Mr. Jacobs stated that SPUR had spent a great deal of time and energy to preserve the views along the northern waterfront. Originally, SPUR had taken the position that the recommendation of the Director of Planning for lower height limits south of the Ferry Building should be supported unless a firm commitment could be obtained that no additional high-rise buildings would be constructed along the northern waterfront if high-rise construction were permitted south of the Ferry Building. At that time, SPUR had indicated that it would support the Port Commission's request for a 550-foot height limit south of the Ferry Building if air rights could be obtained for the remainder of the Port property in the Northern Waterfront to assure that the remaining property would not be used for high-rise construction in the future. Subsequently, the Port Commission had agreed to transfer air rights over its remaining property beyond a height of 40 feet to the Recreation and Park Department; and the Recreation and Park Commission had agreed to become the custodian of those air rights. The transfer of the air rights had been placed in escrow and would become effective upon adoption of a 550-foot height limit for the areas south of the Ferry Building. Under the circumstances, he was confident that no further high-rise construction would take place on Port-owned property in the Northern Waterfront except by mandate of the voters. Mr. Jacobs agreed with the Director of Planning's statement that the proposed project would impair the visual significance of the Bay Bridge; however, he felt that the City would be willing to pay that price in order to protect itself against high-rise construction north of the Ferry Building. In any case, the area

9/10/70

in which the proposed project will be constructed may be subject to change in the future in spite of the doubts of the Director of Planning. He noted that consideration was being given to a proposal for air rights construction over the trans-bay terminal building; and, if such a project were to be undertaken, he assumed that it would result in construction of a high-rise building. Since the cost of construction of a platform over the water would require that any project to be constructed on the completed platform provide a certain amount of floor area, it was his opinion that the only two alternatives would be to construct the high-rise building being proposed or to construct a building in a style similar to the Oceanic Development which had already been approved by the Commission and which will be in effect a high-rise building lying on its side; and he felt that either type of development on the subject property might be equally damaging.

Miss Wolfe then introduced Ron C. Lord, Manager of the Trans-Pacific Passenger Conference. Mr. Lord stated that many new passenger ships are being commissioned in spite of the fact that some people feel that passenger shipping is declining. Whereas 156 passenger ships called in San Francisco in 1969, he estimated that no less than 176 vessels carrying 176,000 passengers will be calling in San Francisco by 1974. The visitors brought by the passenger ships will bring prosperity to San Francisco; and he felt that the City must have a facility to accommodate them on their arrival. He stated that his organization liked the plans which were being proposed by the Port Commission and felt that the proposed project would be a public asset insofar as it would afford access to the waterfront. Under the circumstances, he urged that the request of the Port Commission be approved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked what would be paid per passenger for use of the proposed passenger terminal. Mr. Lord replied that he assumed that the Steamship Companies would continue to pay the same rent which they are paying at the present time.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked how rates are established for use of passenger ship terminals in other ports. Miss Wolfe replied that none of the ports in the United States currently charge on a per passenger basis; instead they charge only rental and wharfage fees. She indicated that the Port of San Francisco intends to continue the same pattern unless a decision is made by other ports in the United States to charge on a per passenger basis since passenger ships are generally regarded as an asset to the community rather than as an asset in terms of the port's finances.

Commissioner Ritchie asked for an indication of other cities which have facilities similar to the one being proposed for San Francisco. Miss Wolfe replied that Los Angeles has a larger passenger ship terminal than that being proposed for San Francisco; however, the San Francisco terminal will be modeled on multi-use facilities which are presently in existence in Hong Kong and Sidney, Australia. Miss Wolfe then introduced Worth B. Fowler, President of the American President Lines.

9/10/70

Mr. Fowler stated that his company operates two passenger ships which make calls in San Francisco; and he believed that cruise-ship travel will increase in the future. He stated that the passenger ship facilities presently available in San Francisco are not the type of facilities which cruise-passengers expect; and he felt that the terminal being proposed by the Port Commission would be an ideal facility. Yet, since the proposed passenger terminal would not be self supporting, it would have to be built in conjunction with other facilities; and he felt that the overall package being proposed by the Port Commission would be a good development. In conclusion, he stated that New York City had never constructed any terminal facilities for passenger ship vessels on Manhattan. However, he believed that a new passenger terminal would be constructed in that city after completion of the World Trade Center.

Miss Wolfe then called on Leo C. Ross, President of the Pacific Far East Lines. Mr. Ross stated that his firm had been founded in 1946 with San Francisco as its home port; and he remarked that he had witnessed very little improvement in the facilities of the Port of San Francisco since that date, in spite of the fact that improvements had been made in other cities along the Pacific Coast. He stated that his firm had agreed to purchase two passenger ships; and, as a result, he supported the Port Commission's proposal for construction of a modern and efficient terminal. Furthermore, he felt that the location which had been chosen for the terminal would be ideal.

The next speaker to be introduced by Miss Wolfe was Walter Hoadley, member of the Chamber of Commerce and Executive Vice-President of the Bank of America. He stated that the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce had reviewed the Port Commission's proposal very carefully and had voted to support the request which Miss Wolfe had put before the City Planning Commission. He felt that the project being proposed would be vital to San Francisco since the Port is in jeopardy. Furthermore, he regarded San Francisco as being one of the few cities left which has an opportunity to preserve a valuable core area; and he felt that the proposed project would play an important part in strengthening downtown San Francisco. He also noted that the proposed project would provide public access to the Waterfront which had not been available in the past. Since he anticipated that the coming year will bring a time economy re-appraisable, he felt that there was a real danger that the proposed project would be lost if the height limit matter were not dispatched promptly.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, assuming that the Chamber of Commerce had examined the fiscal aspects of the Port's proposal, asked Mr. Hoadley how much the proposed passenger ship terminal would cost and how much of that cost would be subsidized by the remainder of the project. Mr. Hoadley replied that the cost of not doing something is an issue which is never discussed; and he remarked that the loss to the City of a viable Waterfront could be a matter of vital importance. He stated that he viewed the project being proposed by the Port Commission as a whole, and he did not feel that the passenger ship terminal could be considered separately from the entire package.

9/10/70

Miss Wolfe replied to the question which had been raised by Commissioner Fleishhacker. The Secretary failed to obtain accurate notes during the presentation but later obtained the following restatement of the remarks from Miss Wolfe on the telephone:

"The minimum rent for the project will be \$400,000 minus the percentage for the passenger terminal. Therefore, if the terminal is 5% of the total investment, \$20,000 per year will be subtracted from the minimum, making a minimum total payment to the Port of \$380,000. In addition, however, we will receive the gross from the passenger terminal, making a total minimum payment to the Port of \$580,000 per year.

"The Port will receive a percentage rental over and above the \$380,000 minimum. For the first mortgage period, however, the first mortgage payments to the passenger terminal will be deducted from the percentage rental. If there is an amount yearly over the minimum and over the cost of the passenger terminal, it will be paid to the Port. In our calculations, we have assumed that in the first thirty years, there will not be a percentage overage. At the end of the first thirty years, whether the passenger terminal is paid for or not, all of the percentage accrues to the Port. At the end of sixty-six years, the entire project will become the property of the Port, free and clear of any payments to the developer.

"We anticipate in today's dollar that the total payment from the developer to the Port, not counting the passenger terminal, will be about \$1,000,000 per year. Total percentage rental we have estimated at \$21,600,000 for the period of the lease, exclusive of the minimum. The estimated total rent received under the lease we estimate to be \$46,720 which is percentage plus minimum. In addition, we estimate a constant of \$200,000 per year from the operation of the passenger terminal."

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that if he had correctly understood the figures which had been cited by Miss Wolfe, the gist of the matter would be that the Port Commission would receive \$20,000 more each year from the lease if the passenger ship terminal were not to be constructed.

Commissioner Ritchie asked for a precise description of the property which would be involved in the lease and which would provide an annual revenue of \$380,000 for the Port Commission. Miss Wolfe replied that the entire area bounded by the Ferry Building, The Embarcadero, the Bay Bridge, and the Pier Head Line would be leased by the developers; however, she noted that only a small portion of the entire area could be considered to be useable land, since the proposed project would not be allowed to cover an area greater than that presently covered by the existing piers.

9/10/70

In response to a further question raised by Commissioner Ritchie, Miss Wolfe stated that the total site to be leased would have an area of approximately 2,400,000 square feet, whereas the developers would be limited to approximately 550,000 square feet of useable space.

Based on the figures which had been provided by Miss Wolfe, Commissioner Ritchie calculated that the cost to the developers for the useable portions of the site would be approximately 6¢ per square foot per month.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the same financial arrangements had been made for the Oceanic Development.

Miss Wolfe replied in the affirmative, indicating that the Port Commission bases its leases on a factor of 8% of the appraised value of the property.

Commissioner Ritchie asked to whom the subject property had been leased. Miss Wolfe replied that no lease had yet been executed; however, she indicated that the tenant of the property would be the U. S. Steel Corporation, providing that the flexible zoning standards being requested were to be approved.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the U. S. Steel Corporation would pay for construction of the platform on which the proposed buildings would be placed. Miss Wolfe replied in the affirmative and indicated that the Port Commission would not have to pay a single dime for demolition or construction on the site.

Commissioner Porter, noting that economic circumstances can change drastically in a 30-year period, asked if the lease would contain an escalator clause. Miss Wolfe replied that all of the leases negotiated by the Port Commission contain such clauses; however, since the proposed lease would be based on a percentage factor, the escalator clause would lose a great deal of its significance. She then introduced George Turner, President of P. and O. Lines, Inc.

Mr. Turner stated that his firm is the world's oldest and largest passenger ship organization; and he indicated that passenger ships owned by his firm make approximately 30 calls in San Francisco each year with approximately 1,500 passengers on board each vessel. Approximately 1,000 of the passengers remain aboard each vessel while it is in the harbor; and, as the remaining 500 passengers debark, 500 new passengers embark. Because of the fact that San Francisco is such an attractive city, his firm hopes to extend the length of its passengers ship calls in San Francisco to 48 hours; and he estimated that approximately 70,000 passengers will be embarking or debarking in San Francisco by 1974. He stated that he was in favor of the proposed passenger ship terminal; and he remarked that the present passenger facilities on Pier 35 constitute one of the most disgraceful terminals in the world, being in fact nothing more than a cargo shed. He believed that travelers on passenger ships should have a more attractive point of entry to San Francisco; and for that reason, he urged that the request of the Port Commission be approved. Commissioner Fleishhacker asked where the best passenger ship terminal facilities in the world are located. Mr. Turner replied that attractive passenger ship terminal facilities can be found in Hong Kong, Sidney, Los Angeles, Auckland, South Hampton, Lisbon, and Port Everglades, Florida.

9/10/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked what form of payments are made by Steamship Companies to those facilities. Mr. Turner replied that most of the facilities are government sponsored; and, as a result, the Steamship Companies are required to pay only the normal mooring and wharfage rates for passenger ships.

The next speaker to be introduced by Miss Wolfe was Melvin Swig, member of the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Swig believed that the project being proposed by the Port Commission would encourage developments both in international trade and in the visitors and convention trade. He noted that the City collects a substantial amount of money annually from the hotel tax; and recent increases in that revenue have substantiated the fact that tourist trade is increasing in San Francisco. He felt that the visitor and convention trade should be encouraged by the construction of new attractions; and he believed that the proposed project would be an asset in that regard. Furthermore, since the South of Market area is being regenerated, he felt that the subject site would be appropriate for the project being proposed; and, rather than jeopardizing the Waterfront, he believed that the project would enhance the area. Therefore, he urged that the request of the Port Commission be approved.

Edward Lawson, City Planner for the Chamber of Commerce, was the next person introduced by Miss Wolfe. Mr. Lawson remarked that shipping is San Francisco's most basic industry; and he felt that the City should consider itself fortunate to have that type of industry rather than the type of industries which produce pollution. Also, he felt that the City should project its vision 20 years into the future when increased trade relations with the U.S.S.R. and China might be expected. Despite some obvious drawbacks, he believed that there is a great potential for development in the South of Market area; and it was his opinion that the project being proposed by the Port Commission would help renew rather than destroy the Waterfront. In addition, the project would bring millions of dollars to the City, would improve the financial situation of the Port and would provide a new passenger ship terminal which is badly needed. Under the circumstances, he urged that favorable consideration be given to the request of the Port Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that there were still a number of people in the audience who wished to speak, urged that Miss Wolfe encourage her remaining speakers to be brief and to the point. Miss Wolfe then introduced Ed Turner, representative of the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union. Mr. Turner stated that other unions whose members earn their living directly, or indirectly, from Maritime activities joined him in supporting the development proposed by the Port Commission. He doubted that the City would be prepared to spend its own money for construction of the passenger ship terminal; and, therefore, he felt that the opportunity presently available should not be passed up even though the passenger ship terminal would not be a self-supporting operation. He reiterated the statement of the previous speaker to the effect that the passenger facility on Pier 35 is nothing more than a cargo shed; and he indicated that two workers had already been killed in that facility. If a new passenger ship terminal is not constructed in San Francisco, he felt that members of his union would have to move to Los Angeles. However, since they would rather remain in San Francisco, he hoped that the request of the Port Commission would be approved. Mr. Turner also noted that

9/10/70

his union owns property in the vicinity of the subject site; and, as a concerned property owner, the union had no objection to the proposed development. In conclusion, Mr. Turner submitted a written statement which he had intended to present if more time had been available.

The next person called on by Miss Wolfe was Lloyd Pflueger, Manager of the Downtown Association. Mr. Pflueger stated that the Board of Directors of his organization had reviewed the plans for the proposed project and had found them to be perfectly in accord with their development philosophy. Therefore, they wished to go on record as being 100% in favor of the position being taken by the Port Commission.

The last speaker to be introduced by Miss Wolfe was Dan London, a member of the Chamber of Commerce and a past member of the Port Commission. Mr. London stated that he had been a member of the Port Commission when the project presently under consideration was being conceived; and he felt that the City Planning Commission would be making a great mistake in discouraging the proposed development. In conclusion, he noted that a promise had been made to the City when it took over the Port that the Port would blossom and bring additional revenue to the City.

Edwin Barton, 1335 - 46th Avenue, stated that he had earned his fortune from the Bay and that he loves every inch of it. Recently, Miss Wolfe had shown pictures to illustrate how the Waterfront is falling apart; and, because of the abuse which the Waterfront has taken, he felt that some people should be placed in San Quentin. He remarked that every pier on the Waterfront is occupied by some business; and it was obvious that the revenues from those businesses had been wasted instead of being used to maintain the facilities of the Port. When steamships damage Port installations, they are assessed for the amount of the damage; yet, the repairs are not made, leaving one to wonder where the money goes. He stated that he had been a deckhand and that he was not adept at facts and figures; and he believed that many people who have facts and figures at their command are also experts at covering up facts and figures. He wondered how much of the money being earned by the Port Commission actually comes to City Hall to be used to reduce the tax rate; and he questioned whether any firm commitment had been obtained from the passenger ship companies indicating that they would be willing to use the proposed passenger ship terminal if it were constructed. It seemed to him that it was not long ago that San Francisco had one of the finest passenger ship terminals in the world; and, under the circumstances, he did not understand why a new one should be needed at the present time.

Robert Katz, 2 Whiting Place, represented the Telegraph Hill Dwellers. While he did not question Miss Wolfe's dedication to the Port, he did question her facts and opinions. He remarked that the standards which she was requesting the Commission to establish would be in conflict with the Master Plan and with the recommendation of the Director of Planning; and he felt that approval of the Port Commission's proposal would be unfortunate, especially since San Francisco is, in the words of a newspaper columnist, "Beginning to resemble Pittsburgh with a harbor". He noted that the Director of Planning had pointed out that it would be inconsistent to allow high-rise buildings to be constructed over the water when

It is not clear from the evidence whether the defendant was a member of the group at the time of the murder. The evidence is conflicting on this point. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder.

The next question is whether the defendant was a member of the group at the time of the murder. The evidence is conflicting on this point. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder.

The last question is whether the defendant was a member of the group at the time of the murder. The evidence is conflicting on this point. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder.

With regard to the question of whether the defendant was a member of the group at the time of the murder, the evidence is conflicting. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder. The evidence is conflicting on this point. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder.

With regard to the question of whether the defendant was a member of the group at the time of the murder, the evidence is conflicting. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder. The evidence is conflicting on this point. The defendant's own testimony is that he was not a member of the group at the time of the murder. The testimony of the other witnesses is that he was a member of the group at the time of the murder.

9/10/70

such buildings are not allowed inland of the subject site. Furthermore, the voters of San Francisco were being asked to approve the transfer of the Port from the State of California to the City, the slogan which they were given was "Money in our pockets". Yet, when the transfer was achieved, severe conditions were established which have made it necessary for the Port Commission to rely on brutal development of the waterfront in order to earn money. While it has been said that the Port has never received a dime from the City, he remarked that the Board of Supervisors recently approved an appropriation of \$200,000 for the construction of a new building for the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union. Now, the City was being offered the "magnificent" sum of 6¢ per square foot for the privilege of having its view of the Bay Bridge blocked by the proposed development. As a resident of Telegraph Hill, he enjoys the spectacle of seeing ships coming into the harbor; and he agreed that the view of the city from the ships is breath-taking. Yet, he felt that a better location for the proposed passenger ship terminal would be at Fisherman's Wharf or at the base of Telegraph Hill rather than in front of the Embarcadero Freeway. He had previously heard that the estimated cost of the passenger ship terminal would be \$15,000,000; yet, since a figure of \$6,000,000 had been submitted during present hearing, he wondered which of the two estimates was in fact correct.

Miss Wolfe stated that the passenger ship terminal would cost between 15 million and 20 million dollars if it were to be constructed by itself; however, if it were to be constructed in conjunction with other facilities, as presently proposed, it would cost between 5 million and 6 million dollars.

Mr. Katz remarked that Dan London had disqualified himself from voting on the proposed project when it was before the Port Commission because he is in the hotel business; and he felt that it was regrettable that Cyril Magnin had not abstained from voting on the proposal, also, since his firm owns property across the street from the subject site.

Commissioner Porter stated that she regarded it as improper for Mr. Katz to question the integrity of members of the Port Commission before the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Katz stated that he believed that SPUR had worked hard and with good motives to get some good things out of a bad situation; and he had obtained a copy of a trust agreement which would serve to safeguard the 40-foot height limit over the remainder of the Northern Waterfront. However, Mr. Katz felt that such a trust should have been given freely by the Port Commission instead of being made contingent upon approval of a 550-foot height limit for the subject site. Furthermore, whereas the trust would cover only the piers, the Port owns vast holdings inland of the Embarcadero; and, if those properties were to be developed with high-rise buildings, the trust would be meaningless. In addition, the trust would specifically exclude all STOL/PORT operations from the 40-foot height limitation; and, if such uses were to be installed, they would bring noise pollution. Mr. Katz stated that he had understood that the Port of Oakland had recently received \$30 million dollars from the Federal Government; and, if the Port of San Francisco is in financial need, he wondered if it had inquired about the availability of Federal funds. He stated that he was in favor of new developments which would

9/10/70

provide jobs, but he emphasized that jobs can be created by good developments as well as by bad developments. He advised the Commission that Supervisor Boas at a recent meeting of the Board of Supervisors had stated that he would no longer vote for high-rise "juggernauts" because such projects are opposed by the citizens; and, if the citizens are forced to seek satisfaction from the courts, then the alienation between the citizens and their government would increase. In conclusion, Mr. Katz urged the Commission to act in accordance with the Master Plan which it had previously adopted and to disapprove the request being made by the Port Commission.

Mrs. Hans Klussmann, 260 Green Street, represented San Francisco Beautiful. She noted that one of the local theaters is presenting a play entitled, "Promises, Promises"; and she stated that she could recall many promises which had been made by the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors which have never materialized. Time and again people are shown pretty pictures with seagulls and trees; and the word "flexibility" is brought into play profusely. The same tactics had been used during the present hearing. Yet, if the Commission were to approve a 550-foot height limit for the large waterfront area presently under consideration, she believed that "the sky would be the limit". If the project were approved, costs would inevitably escalate; and the result would be that the development would never be constructed as promised. She felt that the remarks of the Director of Planning had made a great deal of sense; and she urged the Commission to review those remarks again before taking final action on the proposal. Also, while she believed Miss Wolfe to be an honest individual, she noted that Miss Wolfe had either been unable or unwilling to answer many of the questions which had been raised regarding the proposal; and she felt that the Commission should have proper answers to those questions before submitting the proposal to a vote. Furthermore, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission had not yet taken a position regarding the proposed development; and she felt that the position of that agency should be known before action is taken by the City Planning Commission. She stated that she did not oppose new development; however, she felt that the Master Plan for the Northern Waterfront area which had been developed with the cooperation of a Citizens Advisory Committee should not be disregarded.

Commissioner Porter asked Mrs. Klussmann if she supported the Director's recommendation for an 84-foot height limit with a 175-foot exemption for a portion of the site. Mrs. Klussman replied that she supported the 84-foot height limit which had been agreed upon when the Master Plan for the Northern Waterfront was adopted. The acceptability of a 175-foot height limit would depend upon the site and location of the property affected. She stated that she also questioned the firmness of the trust agreement which had been worked out between the Port Commission and the Recreation and Park Division.

Gardner Mein, 2563 Divisadero Street, felt that an overall scale model of the subject neighborhood should be prepared by the proponents of the proposed project and reviewed by the appropriate agencies before action is taken by the City Planning Commission to allow "spot zoning" of the subject site. He remarked that the subject portion of the City is valuable and deserving of tender care; and

9/10/70

he suggested that high-rise buildings are like heroin in that they are uncontrollable and can be cured only after it is too late. As an example, height limitations were not established in the Northern Waterfront until the Fontana Apartment Buildings had already been constructed. Like Mrs. Klussmann, he was suspicious about the promises made for prospective developments; and he imagined that the developer wishing to construct the Embarcadero Freeway would emphasize that the structure would only be 76 feet high, would have only two decks, and that it would provide lots of open space. Since the property presently under consideration has been transferred to the City, he felt that the City should be able to create a grand, imaginative, and bold scheme, to enhance the beauty and integrity of the area.

William H. Gilmartin, 2224 Clay Street, represented the Pacific Heights Neighborhood Council. He felt that if San Francisco is going to go into the Real Estate business, it should give its citizens some guarantee that the project being proposed would be successful; yet, too many of the responses made to questions asked during the course of the present hearing had been qualified with phrases such as "I think so", "I hope so", etc. The question which he wished to raise was: "If the project doesn't come off, who will pick up the tab?". He remarked that neither passenger trains nor passenger ships are "going" enterprises at the present time since most people prefer to travel by air; and, as a result, San Francisco's Airport has grown rapidly. He felt that the matter at hand had gone beyond the point of aesthetics and down to the level of "Is this thing going to pay off?". Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should give consideration to that question before proceeding to act on the request of the Port Commission.

Fred Smith, representing the Sierra Club, stated that his organization did not oppose the passenger ship terminal per se; however, it felt that the project should not be subsidized by the City. The members of the Sierra Club did feel that it would be unwise for the citizens of San Francisco to subsidize the terminal by giving up views and amenities. If the proposed project were to be approved, he felt that there would be every reason to expect that the remainder of the waterfront would be developed in the same way; and the members of his organization felt that the waterfront should be developed for all people. Mr. Smith stated that he is a taxpayer, and he remarked that the land value of his property depends on the availability of views and on the overall quality of the City. Thus, he was not interested in short term economic enterprises such as the one presently under consideration which would destroy the quality of the City. In conclusion, he stated that he believed that the citizens of San Francisco would prefer to bear the cost of a passenger ship terminal on the tax rate, if one must be built, rather than face the consequences of the type of project being proposed by the Port Commission.

Stephanie Mills, representing Earth Magazine, stated that she had been a resident of the Bay Area for the past 5 years; and she indicated that she had come to the area because she felt that its priorities were in order. Yet, during the course of the present hearing, she had heard a lot of "red herrings" being drawn

9/10/70

across the trail of the principal subject under consideration, i.e., the question of height limits. She stated that she had no intention of traveling on passenger ships; and she did not feel that the proposed passenger ship terminal would serve any public purpose. To her, the most important thing at stake was the aesthetics of the City; and she felt that the present generation should be concerned about the aesthetic legacy which it will leave behind.

At 5:25 p.m. President Newman announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 5:35 p.m. and proceeded with the hearing of the matter under discussion.

Andrew Butler, 1344 Jackson Street, a representative of the Environment Workshop, remarked that the City's economic crisis had been used again and again as the basis for making aesthetic decisions; and he felt that the time had come when the City should no longer let big business build what and where they wish. San Francisco should not sell itself cheaply since, if quality is maintained, people will be willing to pay the price which quality requires. To him, the shipping companies should use their own money to construct a passenger ship terminal if one is needed; however, he could see why they would be willing to support the proposed project which would provide a terminal at no cost to them.

Pauline Martinez, 505 Grand View Avenue, advised the Commission that she is a board member of the Buena Vista Neighborhood Association; and she suggested that the Commission should schedule its meetings at a later hour so that working people would be able to attend. She remarked that the Steamship Companies, which have been in business in San Francisco for many years, have had many opportunities to combine their resources and to build something for the City; yet, they had not done so, and she did not feel that outside concerns should now be given the right to build the kind of project being proposed because of the support of the Steamship Companies. She remarked that the Northern Waterfront has already been developed with high-rise buildings; and she felt that it would be unfortunate if the same type of development were to be allowed south of the Ferry Building. While views may be enjoyed by the visitors to the City, they are really most important to property owners who sell them to their tenants. She felt that other high-rise buildings would inevitably be constructed south of the Ferry Building if the project presently being proposed by the Port Commission were to be approved; and, if that were to happen, views would be lost. Since the people of San Francisco pay a great deal of money for operation of the Port, she felt that they should be protected against such developments on Port-owned property. In conclusion, she stated that she would like to see the people of San Francisco get money for money; yet, while they are continuing to give money out, they never get any back.

Mrs. E. N. Gibbons, 159 Seal Rock Drive, stated that she had attended several meetings where the proposed development was being discussed; and she remarked that no indication had ever been given that the proponents of the project had discussed the proposal for the passenger terminal with the harbor pilots. She advised the Commission that the area south of the Ferry Building is one of the worst areas in the City for the docking of ships; and she indicated that it sometimes takes as

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's development. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

The third part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

The fourth part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

The fifth part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

The sixth part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

The seventh part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's development. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's development.

9/10/70

long as three hours, with the assistance of four tugboats, for a ship to dock in that area. She felt that San Francisco is a natural city for shipping operations; yet, the facilities of the Port are not being developed to their best potential. She felt that the Port should be reserved for maritime activities and that the building being proposed by U. S. Steel Corporation should not be constructed on the subject property.

Norman Rolph, 1188 Green Street, represented San Francisco Tomorrow. He stated that his organization is concerned with urban conservation; and, of course, the members of the organization were opposed to the proposed project. If it were true that the Port cannot function as a port, and if it had been unloaded on the City by the State as a white elephant, he felt that the City should give it back to the State. He stated that he was suspicious of clever financing gimmicks; and, while he had first felt that the office building was being proposed on waterfront property as an excuse for the passenger ship terminal, he now suspected that the passenger ship terminal was being proposed as an excuse for the office building. Mr. Rolph remarked that San Francisco has a special quality different from other cities which is hard to define; yet, unless the City is careful, that quality will be destroyed. The Oceanic Project had already been approved; and, if the proposed project were to be approved, also, a "Chinese Wall" would eventually develop along the entire waterfront. If the subject property is not needed by the Port Commission for Maritime use, he suggested that it should be used for recreational purposes. In any case, he did not feel that the City Planning Commission should "roll over and play dead whenever a developer waves a few million dollars in front of its nose"; and he urged the Commission to reject the proposed increase in height and to start thinking a little bit more about the overall picture.

Mrs. Kenneth Evers, owner of property at 255 Chestnut Street and a member of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, stated that she had hoped that President Newman would voluntarily disqualify himself from voting on the matter under consideration since he is the son-in-law of Cyril Magnin, President of the Port Commission. Commissioner Porter stated that all the members of the Commission have a difficult time voting on matters such as the one presently under consideration since each of them have friends in the audience whose views on the matter might not coincide with their own. She felt that conflicts of interest should be defined in financial terms; and, since neither Mr. Magnin or Mr. Newman have any financial interest in the Port, she did not feel that a conflict of interest did in fact exist. Furthermore, if the criterion being used by Mrs. Evers to define conflicts of interest were to be applied generally, other members of the Commission might be affected, also. Under the circumstances, she hoped that Mrs. Evers would withdraw her request for Mr. Newman's disqualification.

Mrs. Evers replied that she did not question President Newman's integrity; however she did not wish to withdraw her request for his disqualification. She stated that her husband had served on the Citizen's Committee which had assisted with the preparation of the Master Plan for the Northern Waterfront; yet, after a great deal of effort had been spent to prepare the plan and achieve its adoption, the plan was being ignored. As a result, she found it increasingly frustrating to attend meetings of the City Planning Commission. Furthermore, while

9/10/70

she had always assumed that people talking of the "waterfront" were talking of the existing piers, she had recently found out that the area referred to as the "waterfront" actually extends from The Embarcadero to the Pier Head Line, a distance of 1,200 feet from the shoreline. Even if a building with a height of 84 feet were to be constructed 1,200 feet into the water, it would destroy perspective views; and the situation would be measurably worse if buildings with heights of 175 feet, 400 feet, or 550 feet were to be constructed that far out in the water. As an example, she stated that her property is located 135 feet above The Embarcadero on Telegraph Hill; and, when Pier 29 was recently expanded with a relatively low-rise building, at least 25% of the water view which she had previously enjoyed towards Yerba Buena Island was destroyed. If two more buildings of that sort were to be constructed adjacent to the existing facilities, she would enjoy no water view at all.

Mrs. J. F. Lane, 2760 Green Street, stated that she feared that approval of the proposed project would open the door to other such projects along the waterfront; and she did not understand why there would be any need to locate the proposed development over the water instead of on an inland site located nearer to compatible developments. Although the shipping companies seemed to be extremely anxious to have a new passenger ship terminal, she doubted that they would use it if it were constructed.

Susan Smith, affiliated with San Francisco Travel Service, urged that Port lands which are not needed for maritime uses be reserved as public open space. She advised the Commission that a task force recently appointed by the Governor had reported that one of the major problems of ports is their shortage of water-side land for terminal facilities since those properties are being used for other purposes; and the task force recommended that the State should underwrite the expansion and modernization of its ports, if necessary. Under the circumstances, she did not understand why the City of San Francisco should be required to support the expansion and modernization of its port with detrimental developments such as the one presently under consideration. She did not feel that the City would derive any benefit from the proposed passenger ship terminal; and she noted that the passenger ship business is already receiving a subsidy of \$400 from the Federal Government for each passenger carried on luxury cruises. During the next nine months, passenger ships will make calls in San Francisco on only six occasions; and she felt that it would be better for those ships to dock at finger piers rather than for the City to burden itself with the unnecessary expense of a passenger ship terminal. While Fort Everglades, Florida, may have a modern passenger ship terminal, San Francisco is not a warm water port attractively situated and in need of a similar facility. In concluding her remarks, Mrs. Smith remarked that during the past week the city of London had denied a permit for a 2,000-room high-rise hotel on the basis that such a structure would not conform to the historic character of the city and would destroy the very quality which visitors seek in the city in the first place. She felt that San Francisco should adopt a similar attitude.

9/10/70

Lewis Lindsay, a member of the Citizens Planning Committee, remarked that the height of the Ferry Building is 84 feet; and he felt that other developments along the waterfront should not exceed that height. He then asked how far the proposed development would extend into the water. The Director replied that the platform for the project would extend 700 feet into the water from the shoreline.

Mr. Lindsay stated that he was concerned about the affect which the proposed development would have on the waterfront. Furthermore, he questioned whether the unloading of all passenger ships should be concentrated in one place. He did not feel that anything is wrong with the passenger ship terminals which are presently being used; and he suggested that the best way to improve the waterfront would be to upgrade the facilities which are presently in existence. The project being proposed seem to him to be a money-making promotion; and he felt that it would be economically unsound, environmentally disastrous, and aesthetically hideous. In conclusion, he stated that he was in agreement with the previous speaker who had suggested that the issue of conflict of interest ought to be investigated.

Rudolf F. Koch, 25 Forest Side Avenue, remarked that the City Planning Commission sits in a very responsible position; yet, while San Francisco should have good city planning, every place one looks one sees the results of poor city planning. In fact, although he had not lived in San Francisco 10 or 15 years ago, he believed that the City must have looked better at that time. It seemed to him that no one can doubt the fact that the waterfront needs redevelopment; however, instead of being undertaken on a piece-meal basis, the redevelopment of the waterfront should be accomplished on an overall basis and in harmony with the needs of the City. He noted that the Port of Oakland has been expanding significantly in the last few years; and, since Oakland has better facilities for moving freight to and from the docks, it seemed to be natural that the Port of Oakland should be expanding more rapidly than the Port of San Francisco.

Connie Parrish, representing the Friends of the Earth, believed that San Francisco had become an international city with wealth and fame because earlier residents of the City knew how to build without destroying the natural beauty of the City; and she felt that the wisest course for San Francisco to follow would be to keep the flavor of the City as it is instead of following the lead of other cities and becoming over-built. She believed that the cost of high-rise buildings to the taxpayers far outweighs the tax benefits which are derived from such building; and the inevitable result of such buildings is more traffic, more smog, more congestion, and loss of views. Miss Parrish remarked that New York City is unlivable at the present time; and she felt that it was paradoxical that San Francisco should be considering Manhattanization of its waterfront at a time when New York City is turning its own waterfront into a playground. She urged that the request of the Port Commission be disapproved.

Michael M. Levin, 834 - 29th Avenue, indicated that he was suspicious of hidden motives which inevitably arise when developments such as the one presently under consideration are proposed. With regard to his own motives, he stated that

9/10/70

he had begun to be concerned about the City when he became aware of what is happening to it; and, from the standpoint of common sense, he felt that too much large scale development of the type under consideration is being allowed in the City. While he felt that the opposition stood little chance against big business and government, he was still hopeful that the appointive and elective officials of the City would be willing to work for the good of the people. Supervisor Boas, for one, had already observed that the people are becoming alienated from their government; and he had indicated that he would not support any high-rise "juggernauts" with his vote in the future. Supervisor Ertola, on the other hand, had expressed the opinion that high-rise development is great and had indicated that he loves steel and glass buildings regardless of their location. Mr. Levin said that he would not argue with the members of the City Planning Commission if they shared Supervisor Ertola's point of view; however, he hoped that the members of the Commission would be more concerned about the citizens of San Francisco than about minority economic interests. He felt that the presentation which had been made by the Director had indicated that the proposed development would have a terrible effect on the skyline; and he urged the Commission to give careful consideration to the Director's recommendation, which was obviously based on costly studies, before reaching an irreversible decision on the issue under discussion.

Mrs. Bloxam, 3 Montague Place, stated that she had traveled a great deal on passenger ships; and she questioned whether anyone traveling on a passenger ship had ever chosen his destination because of the quality of the terminal facilities offered by a particular city or country. In fact, some of the nicest places that she had ever visited had had no terminal facilities whatsoever... passengers had disembarked onto lighters which had carried them to shore. Under the circumstances she questioned whether ship passengers would sign up for Los Angeles instead of San Francisco merely because Los Angeles has a more attractive steamship passenger facility than San Francisco. She regarded the proposed steamship passenger terminal as being the "sweetener" in the package being presented by the Port Commission; and she doubted that the City Planning Commission would even consider overriding the recommendation of the Director of Planning and their own Master Plan if the proposal had not been offered with such a "gimmick". The "gimmick" might also affect the decision of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission since it would make the proposed project seem to be "water-related". If the voters of San Francisco had known what affect local ownership of the Port would have on the City and the waterfront, she doubted that they would have voted for the transfer of the Port from the State to the City. Furthermore, while developments such as the one under consideration and the Oceanic Project, which had already been approved by the Commission are always presented with the promise of large amounts of free money and an increase in the tax base, she had recently heard a representative of the Oceanic Project state that the proposed project would be served by a 50-inch sewer pipe; and she wondered whether the existing sewer facilities beneath the Embarcadero are large enough to accommodate such a large addition. If not, she wondered who would pay for the installations which would be needed. Furthermore, a State Commission had already put the City on notice that its sewage facilities are not adequate; and, under the circumstances she did not feel that the taxpayers should have to bear the cost of providing facilities for the processing of sewage from projects such as the one under consideration in addition to bearing the cost for improvement of the facilities to serve existing buildings.

9/10/70

Mr. Barton indicated that he had recently heard a statement to the effect that both Pier 41 and the Belt Line Railway would be eliminated; and he wondered if that statement were true. Miss Wolfe replied that the Belt Line Railway ties into Pier 43 and not Pier 41.

A woman in the audience asked who would pay for the space to be occupied by Customs Officials and Agricultural Inspectors in the passenger ship terminal. Miss Wolfe replied that the Port would continue to provide space for such functions.

Mr. Katz asked if all of the buildings shown on the model of the subject neighborhood which had been provided by the Port Commission are presently in existence. Miss Wolfe replied in the negative and indicated that she had intended to display the model in a "denuded" state if more time had been available for her presentation. However, she indicated that all of the buildings shown on the model would more than likely be built. She then removed the facsimiles of buildings not yet completed from the model.

Sherri Thorpe stated that she had not received an agenda for the present meeting in spite of the fact that she had requested that her name be placed on the Commission mailing list. Therefore, she had not had an opportunity to familiarize herself with the subject under discussion. She asked if the Department of City Planning has a representative who attends meetings of the EOC. The Director replied that the Department sends no formal representative to meetings of the EOC; however, members of the staff do meet with that agency on an informal basis to discuss subjects of mutual concern.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker and seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, that the draft resolution which had been placed before the members of the Commission be adopted and that the recommendation of the Director of Planning be approved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he was in complete sympathy with the Port's need for additional revenue and with the need for an improved passenger ship terminal; however, he felt that both objectives could still be achieved if the recommendation of the Director of Planning were followed and if the request of the Port Commission for a 550-foot height limit were disapproved. He acknowledged the fact that the City Planning Commission should be concerned with the economic impact of proposals under consideration; however, in the present instance, he felt that it should have been the responsibility of the Port Commission to prove without any question of doubt, that they would be deprived of sufficient revenue if the project being proposed were not constructed. He remarked that no businessman would make economic decisions without having precise figures at hand; and, while Miss Wolfe had orally cited some figures, they had seemed to him to be complicated and indecisive. He noted that the original plan for the Northern Waterfront which had been prepared by John S. Bolles and Associates had recommended maximum heights of 65 or 84 feet for the waterfront; and he noted that the Department of City Planning had been willing to co-operate and recommend slightly

9/10/70

higher height limits in certain areas out of consideration for the interests of the Port. In fact, the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended a combination of an 84-foot and a 175-foot height limit for the subject site; and, since no showing had been made by the Port Commission that an economic development would be impossible under those standards, he felt that the action of the City Planning Commission should be based on planning considerations and that the recommendations of the Director should be approved.

Commissioner Porter stated that she intended to vote against the motion which had been made by Commissioner Fleishhacker. Since she had already voted for a 400-foot height limit for the subject property in January, it would seem strange to vote in support of a reduction of that height limit to 175 feet at the present time. Furthermore, the Port Commission had stated that the proposed project would not be feasible unless a height limit of 550-feet were to be allowed; and she was willing to accept the facts and figures upon which that decision had been reached. Finally, she pointed out that the area under consideration is a desolate and abandoned area which is in need of new development; and she felt that the development being proposed would be desirable. In any case, when final plans are formulated for the proposed project, they will have to come before the City Planning Commission for review and approval; and the Commission would be able to determine at that point whether the project being proposed would be in the best interests of the City. In conclusion, Commissioner Porter stated that she would prefer that the subject property be developed with one tall building and lots of open spaces rather than with another project like the Oceanic Development.

Commissioner Mellon, also, felt that it would be inconsistent for him to vote for a reduction of the height limit on the subject property to 175-feet since he had already voted in favor of a 400-foot height limit for the property. The Commission's previous recommendation for a 400-foot height limit had been submitted to the Board of Supervisors; and the Board had referred it back to the Commission for further consideration because it felt that a 400-foot height limit would not provide the economic feasibility needed by the Port. He stated that the Port had supplied him with general information to prove that a 550-foot height limit is needed in order to derive economic benefits from the proposed project; and he felt that matters such as height, open space, and public access to the Bay were factors which the City Planning Commission should consider with the interests of all people of San Francisco in mind. He pointed out that the proposed project would provide many amenities which are not available on the site at the present time. He also noted that the proposed project would broaden the tax base; and it would provide employment, especially for minorities. In view of the fact that the proposed project would provide employment opportunities, particularly for minority people, it would help to overcome one of the City's greatest problems, that of unemployment. In conclusion, Commissioner Mellon stated that he did not believe that the developers of the proposed project would come to San Francisco willing to spend between 100 and 200 million dollars with a view towards destroying the City.

9/10/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he did not take the position that all development should be discouraged; and he indicated that he was interested in increasing the tax base and improving the subject property. However, he did not like the project which was presently being proposed.

Commissioner Finn indicated that he subscribed to the remarks which had been made by Commissioner Mellon; and he, also, intended to be consistent and vote for the 550-foot height limit since he had previously voted for the 400-foot height limit. He stated that he has great confidence in Miss Wolfe; and he knew that the figures which she had presented were accurate and true. As a native San Franciscan, he had observed many changes in the City, some of which had not been for the best; however, in view of the fact that San Francisco has taken on the responsibility for the Port, and in view of the fact that the City has an enormous tax problem, he felt that the members of the Commission should face reality and vote for the proposed project. He was confident that no "Chinese Wall" would be constructed along the waterfront; and he noted that the proposed project, in addition to improving the economy of San Francisco, would provide the public with access to the water. Furthermore, since San Francisco has lost many different types of employment, he felt that new employment opportunities should be welcomed.

Commissioner Rueda asked if properties south of the subject site are subject to height limitations. The Director replied that properties located south of the Bay Bridge are not subject to height limitations.

Commissioner Rueda stated that he believed that the obstruction that the proposed project would create would not be significant compared to the good which would be derived from the project; and he indicated that he intended to vote against Commissioner Fleishhacker's motion.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Commission had never received a clear explanation of the economic need for the project being proposed by the Port Commission; and he believed that the Port Commission had not made any effort to develop imaginative alternate plans for the site under the 84 and 175-foot height limits which had been recommended by the Director of Planning. While he had previously voted to approve a 400-foot height limit for the subject site, he did not feel that he was being inconsistent in supporting a lower height limit at the present time since the Port Commission, which had previously found the 400-foot height limit to be acceptable, had requested the Commission to reconsider its previous action. He noted that the proposed project would have to be approved by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission; and he remarked that the position of that agency had not been made clear. It was his understanding that the McAteer-Petris Act had placed limitations on the uses, the water coverage, and on the filling of tidelands of the Bay; and since the Bay Conservation and Development Commission had not yet determined whether the proposed project would meet those restrictions, he felt the Commission would be "putting the cart in front of the horse" by acting on the proposal before the position of BCDC is known. Since BCDC has not acted, the availability of the subject site for the project being proposed is unclear; and, since he could not imagine putting together such a large project until the availability of the site is assured, he felt that action

9/10/70

by the Commission on the height limitation should be deferred pending action by BCDC. He indicated that he regarded the proposed hotel as being a major high-rise building; and he felt that it should be moved back towards the shoreline instead of being put so far out in the water as depicted on the model. He also noted that the scale of the model, like the one which had been presented to depict the Oceanic Development, failed to reflect the true size of the project being proposed. While one of the previous speakers had stated that the proposed development would block out the view of one of the towers of the Bay Bridge and that the proposed project would be worth that price to the City, he felt that loss of views of the bridge from the City and of the City from the bridge would be a very high price for the City to pay for the proposed development. In conclusion, Commissioner Ritchie stated that he enjoys disembarking from passenger steamships on to active piers, and the idea of disembarking onto a red carpeted terminal building would have little appeal for him.

Commissioner Mellon acknowledged that the proposed project had not yet been approved by BCDC and that no one could predict what their action would be. However, if the project were to be disapproved by the City Planning Commission, he was convinced that it would be impossible to obtain the approval of BCDC.

Commissioner Fleishhacker called attention to the fact that the project itself was not before the Commission for review. The subject under discussion was one of height limitations; and, after the height limits have been established, the proposed project will be submitted to the Commission at a later date for review and approval.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the proposed 550-foot height limit would not allow the developers to bring in a project with a height of 600 feet; however, it would allow them the flexibility to determine whether the best project for the site should have a height of 200, 300, 400, or 550 feet. Once the height limit has been established, the developers would be able to commence work on detailed plans for the project; and, when final plans for the project are submitted to the City Planning Commission for review, the Commission will have an opportunity to determine whether the project will be appropriate for the site.

President Newman stated that he did not feel that he had any conflict of interest regarding the proposal under consideration; and he indicated that the City Attorney had agreed that conflict of interest would not be involved. However, because of the citizens concern which had been expressed, he intended to abstain from voting on the matter.

When the question was called on Commissioner Fleishhacker's motion, Commissioners Fleishhacker and Ritchie voted "Aye"; Commissioners Finn, Mellon, Porter, and Rueda voted "No". Therefore, the motion failed for want of a majority.

9/10/70

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Mellon that a resolution be adopted to modify the text of the City Planning Code to establish a 550-foot height limit for the portion of the subject property which had previously been recommended to have a 400-foot height limitation.

Miss Wolfe, noting that the recommendation for a 400-foot height limitation had extended only 400 feet from the shoreline, stated that it was important that the area should be expanded so that the 550-foot height limit would extend 700 feet from the shoreline to provide greater flexibility for planning of the proposed project.

Commissioner Porter asked if expansion of the area was being requested so that the designers would have more freedom in placing the proposed buildings on the site; and, after Miss Wolfe had replied in the affirmative, she remarked that the Commission would be able to raise objections regarding the proposed placement of the buildings when the project is submitted for conditional use authorization.

Commissioner Ritchie remarked that the proposed project would contain two high-rise buildings; and he expected that the intent of the developers would be to place the high-rise hotel building on the edge of the platform where it would have the most damaging effect on views. He and Commissioner Fleishhacker agreed that the developers would want to place the buildings in locations where they would be most attractive to prospective tenants; and that objective would more than likely not be to the best interests of the citizens of San Francisco.

After further discussion, Commissioners Porter and Mellon amended the motion and seconded it to specify that a height limit of 550 feet should be approved for the area bounded generally by the south line of Howard Street extended, a line parallel to the Waterfront Line and 700 feet distance therefrom, the north line of Folsom Street extended, and the Waterfront Line.

Commissioner Rueda asked if he were correct in understanding that the actual project being proposed would come before the Commission at a later date for review and approval. Commissioner Porter replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that a 550-foot height limit would for all practical purposes, be a non-height limit; and he remarked that such a height limit had never been established by another community.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that all height limits are arbitrary.

9/10/70

When the question was called, the Commission voted 4 - 2 to adopt Resolution No. 6626, approving text amendments to the City Planning Code which, within the 84-foot Section No. 2 of the Ferry Building Area Variable Special Height District previously recommended for adoption under Resolution No. 6476, would allow height limit exceptions up to 550 feet within an area bounded by the south line of Howard Street extended, a line parallel to the Waterfront Line and 700 feet distant therefrom, the north line of Folsom Street extended, and the Waterfront Line. Commissioners Finn, Mellon, Porter and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioners Fleishhacker and Ritchie voted "No", Commissioner Newman abstained from voting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Monday, September 14, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Monday September 14, 1970, at 7:30 P.M. in the auditorium of Balboa High School.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, James J. Finn, John Ritchie and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, member of the City Planning Commission.

The Staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs, James Paul, Planner III - Housing Specialist; Dennis Ryan, Planner III - Design; Trixie Ryan, Planner II; Emily Hill, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR RESIDENCE--A PROPOSAL FOR CITIZEN REVIEW.

President Newman welcomed the audience and stated that the purpose of the public hearing would be to obtain comments on the Improvement Plan for Residence, a report which was published by the Department of City Planning in June, 1970. The first public hearing on the report had been held in July; and another public hearing had been scheduled for September 28 at the Frank McCoppin Elementary School. During October, the Improvement Plan policies would be reviewed on the basis of comments obtained by the public and considered for adoption as the housing element of San Francisco's Master Plan. He emphasized that the Commission would not take any action at the conclusion of the present hearing.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that more than six hundred notices had been mailed to advise people of the present hearing in spite of the fact that only a few people were present in the audience; and he indicated that more than 2,300 copies of the report had been distributed in the community to date. In addition, the staff of the Department of City Planning had held a number of meetings with neighborhood and civic groups to explain and discuss the report. He remarked that the improvement plan is divided into three sections; however, he emphasized that only the second section, a series of objectives and policies for residence, would be adopted by the City Planning Commission for inclusion in the City's Master Plan.

William Best, 307 Foote Avenue, represented the Cayuga Improvement Association. Mr. Best stated that the members of his Association had not had sufficient time to study the report; and he regretted that he had not received earlier notice of the hearing. In conclusion, he stated that the members of his Association seemed to be quite displeased with the report from what they had seen of it.

September 14, 1970

The Director stated that the Cayuga Improvement Association had been added to the Department's mailing list only during the past week; and he emphasized that the Commission would hold another hearing on the report on September 28.

Bruno A. Davis, 1130 Silliman Street, represented the Portola Heights Voters League, Inc. He stated that the members of his organization had read the staff report and had held a meeting to discuss it objectively. They felt that the report was quite good and very complete. However, since the neighborhood represented by his organization has a large amount of vacant or unused land, the principal concern of the members of his organization was that the recommendations contained in the staff report should be kept in tact and not changed and that any action taken by the Commission would not change the character of the neighborhood. He noted that houses are being constructed in University Heights which have 3 or 4 bedrooms and which sell for \$45,000; and he hoped that nothing would be done to change the present pattern of development. Therefore, if the Commission wished to change the recommendations of the Staff, he hoped that the members of his organization would have an opportunity to review the revised recommendations before final action is taken by the Commission. In conclusion, he stated that he had noted nothing in the report to indicate the probable cost of the projects being proposed; and, since the tax rate is going up, the members of his organization were concerned about the financing and cost of the implementation program outlined in the report.

The Director stated that everyone on the Department's mailing list would receive a copy of the revised recommendations of the staff which would be submitted to the City Planning Commission for consideration and action. With regard to the issue of cost, he remarked that everything which has been proposed in the initial 2-year program are projects which are known to be feasible. The remainder of the implementation program is long-range; and, as a result, it would be impossible to devise any reliable cost estimates for those phases of the program.

Mr. Davis remarked that all public agencies, even BART, provide the public with cost estimates when new projects are proposed; and he felt that the recommendations of the staff should be supplemented with financial information and that the public should have a right to review that information before the report is adopted by the Commission.

Al Gemmet, 1167 Burrows Street and President of the Portola Heights Voters League, concurred with the remarks which had been made by Mr. Davis. He also remarked that the members of his organization had understood that the type of housing being proposed for their neighborhood would be privately financed.

Mr. Stanley M. Friedman, President of the League of Woman Voters of San Francisco, read and submitted the following statement:

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000

September 14, 1970

"For a number of years, the League has called for a statement of public policy on how the City's housing needs are to be met. We asked for a statement which would give public recognition to the housing needs of all San Francisco's residents. The League has been particularly concerned with housing for low and moderate income persons, for whom there is the greatest deficiency of decent housing. We welcome the Improvement Plan for Residence. It not only recognizes San Francisco's housing problems; it will also guide future development, and it makes specific proposals which, we hope, will ease the difficulties faced by low and moderate income households.

"Because of San Francisco's low vacancy rates, large scale renewal -- and even code enforcement -- without public aid for low income owners and tenants, results in extreme difficulties for residents. Deteriorated housing is destroyed to make way for new housing, but, in the meantime, people have no place to go. For this reason we support the policy of neighborhood maintenance, with an emphasis on rehabilitation, and with a minimum of displacement.

"We support a code enforcement program which offers low interest loans and grants for needy owners. But there must be some kind of rent stabilization with this type of program. Repairs made with government subsidized, low interest loans must not be used to penalize low income tenants with higher rents that force them to move.

"There are owners who are unwilling to comply with housing codes. Along with other California Leagues, we support changes which will give tenants some legal tools in such cases. We strongly endorse the establishment of rent escrow and receivership programs. And we are encouraged that the Improvement Plan for Residence mentions both types of programs as ways to improve the City's program of code enforcement. We also feel that a tenant should be protected from retaliatory eviction or rent raise if he complains about a code violation.

"The Planning Department took a welcome step when it identified 15 housing opportunity areas. Without further information, we cannot comment other than that first priority should be given to building the public housing units that have already been authorized, with emphasis on housing for families.

September 14, 1970

"San Francisco has more than one-half of the Bay Area's Public Housing, and this housing is concentrated in two or three neighborhoods within the City itself. It should be City policy that future public housing be distributed throughout the City.

"Like all City neighborhoods, all Bay Area communities should do their share in planning with, and building for low income people. A regional housing solution is imperative, and the Improvement Plan recognizes the fact. Our National organization, the League of Women Voters of the United States, will continue its efforts on behalf of legislation to assure low cost housing in all communities. For example, we support the withholding of grants-in-aid from communities which fail to encourage low and moderate income housing.

"The League of Women Voters of San Francisco gives enthusiastic support to the Improvement Plan for Residence. For the plan to become an effective instrument of public policy, endorsement is needed, not only by the Planning Commission, but also by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. Some of the recommendations can be implemented only by legislative action at other governmental levels. San Francisco's state and national legislators should be informed of the policy, when it is adopted, and our City's paid lobbyists should be instructed to work for the needed legislation."

Mr. Lacey, representing SPEAK, stated that he had attended the annual conference of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association last Friday; and it was his impression that while SPUR was in general agreement with the Department of City Planning's report on the Improvement Plan for Residence, that organization regarded the program being proposed as a "band-aid approach" to the City's housing problem in the sense that it would allow changes which come from the outside to affect the city rather than allowing the citizens of San Francisco to decide what type of a city they want and then to plan for the future on that basis.

The Director stated that the staff had received a written commentary on the report from SPUR; and he indicated that the comments of that organization would be analyzed and evaluated in the final report which the staff will present to the Commission. He did not feel that the program proposed in the report would be a "band-aid approach"; and he noted that the first and most important objective cited in the report specified that the quality and diversity of San Francisco's residential communities should be maintained. In line with that policy, the implementation section of the report had stressed the importance of neighborhood maintenance and use of code enforcement programs. In basic terms, that objective was a statement that the strongest thing which San Francisco has in its favor is its existing stock of housing and people; and it was the position of the staff of the Department of City Planning that those

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to determine the nature of the problem. This involves gathering information about the problem and its context. The second step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves analyzing the information gathered in the first step to determine the factors that are contributing to the problem. The third step is to develop a plan of action to address the problem. This involves determining the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and the resources that will be needed to implement the plan. The fourth step is to implement the plan. This involves carrying out the steps that were identified in the third step. The fifth step is to evaluate the results of the plan. This involves determining whether the plan has been successful in solving the problem and whether any adjustments need to be made.

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population of the United States is of European descent. This is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years. It is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years. It is a fact which has been recognized by the government and the people of the United States for many years.

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the problem. The investigator must also determine the objectives of the study and the methods to be used. The investigator must also determine the resources available for the study and the time frame for the study. The investigator must also determine the potential risks and benefits of the study and the ethical considerations of the study. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the community and the environment. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the economy and the society. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the culture and the heritage. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the health and the safety. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the education and the research. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the environment and the climate. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the energy and the resources. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the transportation and the infrastructure. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the communication and the information. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the science and the technology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the arts and the culture. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the sports and the recreation. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the tourism and the industry. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the agriculture and the forestry. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the fishing and the hunting. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the mining and the extraction. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the manufacturing and the production. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the services and the trade. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the government and the public administration. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the law and the justice. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the religion and the spirituality. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the philosophy and the ethics. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the psychology and the behavior. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the sociology and the anthropology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the history and the archaeology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the geography and the cartography. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the meteorology and the climatology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the oceanography and the hydrology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the astronomy and the astrophysics. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the physics and the chemistry. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the biology and the botany. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the medicine and the health care. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the agriculture and the forestry. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the fishing and the hunting. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the mining and the extraction. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the manufacturing and the production. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the services and the trade. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the government and the public administration. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the law and the justice. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the religion and the spirituality. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the philosophy and the ethics. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the psychology and the behavior. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the sociology and the anthropology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the history and the archaeology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the geography and the cartography. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the meteorology and the climatology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the oceanography and the hydrology. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the astronomy and the astrophysics. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the physics and the chemistry. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the biology and the botany. The investigator must also determine the potential impact of the study on the medicine and the health care.

September 14, 1970

assets should be maintained. In addition, however, the staff had noted the housing problem being faced by the city and had recommended various criteria to specify where new housing should be located. While some people would recommend that a certain population goal should be established for the city, the staff had not been willing to play such a "numbers game" in preparing its recommendations. He remarked that San Francisco is not being inundated with new people; and, in fact, the recent census had seemed to confirm that the population of the City is decreasing. In any case, the quality of the environment seemed to him to be of greater importance than the number of persons living in the city.

Mrs. W. A. Best, 397 Foote Avenue, asked why no public housing had been proposed for Monterey Heights or for the neighborhoods adjacent to Lake Merced. The Director replied that the recommendations contained in the report were more concerned with the overall problem of housing and were not limited exclusively to public housing. In fact, public housing proposals constitute only a small portion of the report. In that regard, however, the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that no area of the city should have more public housing in it relative to the total amount of housing in the area than does the city as a whole relative to its entire housing stock. Alternatively, the staff was proposing that every area of the city should have approximately the same amount of public housing unless certain neighborhoods specifically request a greater share of that type of housing. Referring to a map which was on display, he noted that the eastern part of the city presently has more than the city wide average of public housing units whereas the western portion of the city has less than the city wide average on a planning area basis; and the staff of the City Planning Department had recommended that public housing units should be dispersed equitably throughout the city in all areas, including the planning areas in which Lake Merced and Monterey Heights are located.

A gentleman in the audience asked what rationale would be used for the equal distribution of public housing units throughout the city. The Director replied that if an effort were made to achieve a situation wherein no stigma would be attached to one type of housing as opposed to another, then it would be logical to have scattered site public housing so that the public housing units would be absorbed in a neighborhood like any other type of housing. At the present time, when public housing units are centralized in large projects, they tend to create ghettos and to have a stigma attached to them.

During the remainder of the meeting, the Director responded to factual questions about the report.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 17, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 17, 1970, at 1:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; Mortimer Fleishhacker, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James K. Carr and Thomas J. Mellon, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV, Ralph A. Mead, Planner IV - Zoning; Walter Stoll, Planner III - Transportation; Patricia Peterson, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Duffy Jennings represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:00 P.M. Field Trip

Members of the Commission and Staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Zoning Hearing on October 1, 1970.

2:15 p.m. 100 Larkin Street

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that he would have to leave the meeting early in order to attend a Public Hearing being held by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission concerning the proposed Ferry Port Plaza project.

The Director asked the Planning Implementation Committee of the Commission (Commissioners Finn, Fleishhacker, and Porter) to meet next Thursday at 1:00 p.m. and the Budget Committee (Commissioners Fleishhacker, Newman and Porter) to meet at 1:45 p.m. on the same date. The regular meeting of the Commission will commence at 2:00 p.m.

9/17/70

The Director advised the Commission that he had received a check in the amount of \$10,000 from the San Francisco Foundation to be used as part of the matching local funds for the proposed housing and recreation study of Chinatown. It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6627 be adopted to express the Commission's appreciation to the San Francisco Foundation for its contribution.

The Director distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared to revise the 5-year Urban Beautification Program and to authorize the staff of the Department of City Planning to take whatever steps are necessary to secure a Federal grant in support of the program. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6628.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked that copies of the resolution which will be adopted by the Board of Supervisors to request a new urban beautification grant be distributed to members of the City Planning Commission.

R70,60 - Powell Street (Sutter to California) and California Street (Joice to Powell Street), parking bays and sidewalk narrowing.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on the Powell Street Project as follows:

"The cable car-auto vehicle accident rate has been extremely high in the three blocks of Powell Street between Sutter and California Streets where the grade averages 16 per cent. The proposed solution is to keep automobiles off the cable car tracks entirely, and to do this, parking will be prohibited in the curb lanes.

"The Powell Street right-of-way is 66.7 feet wide in these blocks and the sidewalks are now each 15 feet wide, except for minor cut-backs. Under the proposed plan, the westerly sidewalk will be retained at 15 feet and the easterly sidewalk will be narrowed by 1.6 feet, because the cable car tracks are slightly off center, to provide a moving traffic lane of 10 feet northbound.

"Thus the new layout of the street will be: a westerly sidewalk 15 feet wide, except where this is a loading bay where it will be 7.5 feet wide; a southbound traffic lane (downhill) 9.5 feet wide; an 18.8 foot lane exclusively for the cable cars; a 10-foot northbound traffic lane (uphill); and the easterly sidewalk 13.4 feet wide except where there is a parking bay where it will be only 6.7 feet wide.

9/17/70

"With the construction of the Knott Hotel at Powell and Sutter Streets, the easterly sidewalk will be reduced to 6.7 feet between the corner and the hotel's garage entrance approximately 108 feet northerly to provide an entrance lane to the garage. The easterly sidewalk has already been cut back to 11 feet at the corner of Bush Street to facilitate right turns. The 48-foot long loading bay in this block will be on the west side of the street in front of a restaurant and an art gallery.

"Between Bush and Pine Streets, two loading bays will be provided, one fronting a grocery store on the east side of the street at Pine Street and one on the west side in the lower half of the block.

"Between Pine and California Streets, there will be a loading bay on the east side fronting residential buildings.

"Where there is an existing cutback at the northeast corner of Bush and Powell Streets, the sidewalk should be restored to a width of 13.4 feet; at the northwest corner it should be restored to 15 feet; there are no right turns here because Bush Street is one way eastbound.

"Some trees will be lost because of the installation of the loading bays. In conjunction with the street work, it would be desirable to have the entire three blocks planted with street trees along the sections where there will be no loading bays."

Commissioner Porter asked how many cars would be able to park in the loading bays. Mr. Walter Stoll, Planner III, Transportation, replied that the loading bays were intended for use by trucks. They would be approximately 48 feet long or equivalent in length to one large moving van.

President Newman asked if automobiles leaving the proposed Knott Hotel would be required to turn right onto Powell Street. Mr. Jung replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the proposed 6-foot sidewalks would be extremely narrow, asked if a survey had been made of pedestrian traffic on the street. The Director replied that pedestrian traffic is relatively light near the crest of the hill; however, the narrow sidewalks would pose a problem in the vicinity of Sutter Street where the concentration of pedestrian traffic is much higher. He noted, however, that the proposed Knott Hotel would provide an arcade adjacent to the sidewalk to accommodate additional pedestrian traffic.

President Newman asked if the staff could recommend any alternate solutions to the problem. Mr. Jung replied in the negative.

[illegible]

It was a very good day for the school. The children were very happy and the teachers were very busy. The children were very happy and the teachers were very busy. The children were very happy and the teachers were very busy.

[illegible][illegible]

Some trees will be lost to the forest, but the loss will be made up by the growth of new trees. The forest will be a better place than it was before, and the people will be better off than they were before.

[illegible]

1. The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Prisons, and the United States Department of Justice, regarding the activities of the following individuals:

9/17/70

Commissioner Porter asked how it would be possible to prevent the loading bays from becoming parking bays. Mr. Jung replied that police enforcement would be required to prevent autos from using the loading bays for parking.

Commissioner Rueda asked if the proposed project would involve the removal of any existing street trees. Mr. Jung replied that some street trees would have to be removed near the crest of the hill; he indicated, however, that part of the staff recommendation was that additional street trees should be planted upon completion of the project.

The Director recommended that the Powell Street project be approved as in conformity with Master Plan provided that the sidewalk is restored to a width of 13.4 feet at the northeast corner of Powell and Bush Streets and to a width of 15 feet at the northwest corner of Powell and Bush Streets, and provided further that street trees are planted along the 3 blocks in the sections that will not have parking bays.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed sidewalk narrowing and installation of loading bays on Powell Street between Sutter and California Streets, as shown on Drawing STR-4550.2, Change 1, is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the sidewalk is restored to a width of 13.4 feet at the northeast corner of Powell and Bush Streets and to a width of 15 feet at the northwest corner of Powell and Bush Streets and provided further that street trees are planted along the 3 blocks in the section that will not have parking bays.

Mr. Jung then reported on the California Street project as follows:

"The Department of Public Works intends to install traffic signals at the intersection of Powell and California Streets, to be activated by the California Street cable car proceeding uphill westbound; it wants to keep automobiles approaching the intersection off the cable car tracks. It is proposed to have a permanent tow-a-way zone in the curb lane on the north side of California Street between Joice and Powell Streets so that there can be two moving lanes of automobile traffic without use of the cable car tracks.

"The two traffic lanes are now a substandard 8.8 feet (8 feet 10 inches) in width, and narrowing the northerly 15-foot sidewalk by 3 feet will make it possible to have two 10-foot lanes between Joice and Powell Streets, a distance of approximately 200 feet. To the west of Powell Street the sidewalks are 12 feet wide. To the east of Joice Street, however, the sidewalks are 15 feet wide down to Grant Avenue. The automobile traffic would be moved off the cable car tracks only for the 200 feet east of Powell Street. An alternate solution would be to have a tow-a-way zone in the curb lane all the way to Powell Street from Kearny Street at the bottom of the hill, at the same time reserving the westbound tracks exclusively for the cable cars, thus giving automobiles two narrow but straight lanes up the hill without having to divert them from

Investigation of the matter was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

The investigation was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

The investigation was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

The investigation was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

It was found that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

The investigation was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

The investigation was made by the committee in the month of January, 1901, and the following facts were ascertained: That the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter, and that the same was found to be a very serious matter.

9/17/70

the tracks mid-block at Joice Street. The proposed sidewalk narrowing would permit the establishment of 10-foot lanes for only 200 feet while the lane width easterly for one and a half blocks remains 8.8 feet.

The Director recommended that the proposed project be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan because an alternate method of keeping automobiles off the cable car tracks by means of a tow-a-way zone should be tried first. He remarked that narrowing the sidewalk for 200 feet would not solve the narrow lane situation on California Street.

Commissioner Porter stated that it seemed to her that widening the traffic lanes only in the two subject blocks would create a situation which might cause more accidents.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the change of sidewalk width on the north side of California Street between Joice and Powell Streets from 15 to 12 feet is in conflict with the Master Plan because an alternate method of keeping automobiles off the cable car tracks by means of a tow-a-way zone should be tried first. Narrowing the sidewalk for 200 feet does not solve the narrow lane situation on California Street.

R70.64 - Market Street median barrier, Ord Street to Burnett Avenue.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The proposal is to replace the metal guard railing in the median strip of upper Market Street with a precast concrete barrier designed to redirect errant vehicles toward their original paths of travel. The required repair and maintenance of the much battered metal railing has placed a disproportionate burden upon City forces.

"The proposed barrier will be 32 inches high. It has been tested by the State Division of Highways and is in use on the Mac Arthur Freeway in Oakland; about 80 feet of it has been installed at Geary Boulevard and Starr King Way. The appearance of the barrier would be improved if it were given a textured surface.

"The barrier is to be installed only where there is now a metal guard railing.

"The cost of the work is estimated at \$146,700, from gas tax funds. The work will include modifying the pavement super-elevation at various locations such as at the curve at Romain Street."

9/17/70

The Director recommended that the project be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the barrier is given a textured surface and is used only in locations where there is now a metal guard railing.

Commissioner Porter asked if any assurance could be given that the new barrier would have a textured surface. The Director replied that the project would be carried out by the Department of Public Works; however, it was the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning that the surface of the barrier should be textured.

Commissioner Ritchie felt that the Commission's approval of the project should be made conditional upon the barrier having a textured surface.

Commissioner Rueda, noting that the existing metal barrier had become quite battered, asked if it would be possible to equip the new barrier with water bumpers similar to those used on the Municipal Railway buses.

Joseph Pelayo, representing the Department of Public Works, did not feel that water bumpers would have any effect because of the speed of automobiles traveling on the street. He also inquired about the type of textured surface which the staff of the Department of City Planning had in mind for the new barrier. The Director replied that the staff had envisioned the type of texture surface that can be obtained through sand blasting; however, details of that sort could be worked out cooperatively between the two departments.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the installation of a concrete barrier in the median to replace the metal railing and modification of pavement super-elevation at various locations on Market Street between Ord Street and Burnett Avenue is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the barrier is given a textured surface and is used only in locations where there is now a metal guard railing.

R70.67 - Mini-park Program. Acquisition of Lot 15, Block 4209, 24th Street west of York Street, and Lots 19, 20 and 21, Block 6481, Curtis Street north of Brunswick Street.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Lot 15, Block 4209 is a 50-foot wide, 104-foot deep vacant lot in the heart of the 24th Street shopping district which extends from Mission Street to Potrero Avenue. Its development as a mini-park presents an opportunity to provide not only recreational space but also a visual bonus for this street. The zone is C-2.

9/17/70

"Lots 19, 20 and 21, Block 6481, a parcel 75 feet by 120 feet on Curtis Street in the Crocker-Amazon foothills, are located on a gentle slope with a good view taking in Mount Davidson, Twin Peaks, Diamond Heights, some of the downtown towers, and the McLaren ridge. A 10-foot alley at the rear of the property might be utilized in the development. The site is in a single-family residential area, zoned R-1. Other undeveloped property nearby is farther up the slope and would be more difficult to develop.

"Both mini-parks will be financed from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (Department of the Interior) grant of \$399,640 for which the City is providing matching funds."

The Director recommended that the acquisitions for the mini-park program be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Porter questioned whether the 24th Street site in the heart of a shopping district, would be an appropriate location for a mini-park; and she asked if an effort had been made to locate an alternate site in the subject neighborhood. The Director replied that he regarded the 24th Street property to be a good site for a mini-park. Since it is located near a neighborhood shopping center, it could be used by children while their parents are shopping or by the parents themselves if they were taking a break in shopping; and, under the circumstances, the mini-park might enjoy maximum utilization. Since the site is bounded on three sides by buildings, only one side of the lot has access to the street; yet, the site would not suffer from lack of sunlight since the open-side faces south.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the 24th Street property is privately owned. Mr. Jung replied in the affirmative.

President Newman asked about the cost of the 24th Street site. Mr. Jung replied that he did not know the exact cost of the property; however, with a total of \$100,000 available, the City hoped to purchase 13 mini-park sites.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the acquisition for the mini-park program of Lot 15, Block 4209, on the north side of 24th Street west of York Street, and Lots 19, 20 and 21, Block 6481, on Curtis Street north of Brunswick, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

At this point in the proceedings, the Director absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting. Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, assumed his chair.

9/17/70

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY FINAL PLANS FOR OFFICE BUILDING AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES
AT CHILDRENS HOSPITAL.

Robert Passmore, Planner V - Zoning, stated that the Commission had approved a conditional use authorization for construction of the proposed building in December, 1969; however, at that time, plans for the building were incomplete since they were based on the hospital's original concept of providing space within the building for the Fantasia Bakery. Since the approval of the Commission had specified that the bakery would not be allowed in the proposed building, plans for the structure had been revised and re-submitted to the Commission for review. The original plans for the building had called for a 7-1/2 floor structure with a height of approximately 84 feet; and the architect had indicated at the time that he hoped to reduce the height of the building to 75 feet, a height which would be approximately 15 feet higher than the adjacent garage. The revised plans called for a building with 7 floors of office space and one parking level above grade for a total height of 91 feet; however, while the height of the building had been increased, the building had been cut back further from the front and side property lines. The building would also have 4 parking levels below grade. Further work would be needed to provide adequate circulation in the garage. While the plans which had been submitted earlier would have provided 105,000 square feet of office space, the new plans would provide the 84,722 square feet of office space. Mr. Passmore stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had also received preliminary plans for the ancillary facilities building which the hospital proposed to construct on the southeast corner of Sacramento and Cherry Streets; however, the staff had not yet completed its review of those plans.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the proposed medical office building would be occupied by doctors who are connected with the hospital. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative, indicating that space would be available for approximately 100 doctors.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked why it had been necessary for the height of the proposed building to be increased from 84 feet to 91 feet. Mr. Passmore replied that the increase in height had resulted from the architect's attempts to concentrate the bulk of the building on the center portion of the site so that setbacks would be available along the front and side property lines.

Commissioner Ritchie inquired about the height of the tallest building presently existing in the Childrens Hospital complex. Gerald Moller, Assistant Administrator of Childrens Hospital, stated that the highest existing building had a height of approximately 84 feet plus a 15-foot penthouse. After introducing the members of the hospital's Board of Directors and their architect, Mr. Moller stated that the architect had undertaken a two-year study to develop an expansion program for the hospital which would involve construction of the proposed medical office building, and ancillary facilities building, and a new nursing wing. Following the purchase of the subject property in March, representatives of Childrens Hospital and their architect had met on several occasions and the staff of the Department of City Planning and with neighborhood organizations to discuss

9/17/70

the revisions which were being made in the plans. In conclusion, he emphasized that the scope of the project had not been increased; instead, the configuration of the project had merely been changed on the site.

William H. Knowles, architect for the applicant, stated that he had nothing to add to the presentation which had been made by Mr. Passmore unless the members of the Commission had questions which they wished to raise.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the proposed building would be uneconomic if it were to be reduced to a height of 75 feet. Mr. Knowles replied that an effort had been made to lower the height of the building by placing the garage deeper in the ground; and, as a result, the cost of each parking stall would be increased by \$6,000.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how the size of the building had been determined. Mr. Knowles replied that an effort had been made to design the building so that it would accommodate all of the doctors who had expressed a desire to obtain space in the building; however, the building which had been designed would accommodate only 80% of the doctors who had expressed interest in the project.

Commissioner Porter inquired about the size of the setbacks which were being proposed. Mr. Knowles stated that the building would have side setbacks of 16 feet, a rear setback of 24 feet, and a front setback of 14 feet.

President Newman asked how traffic would exit from the proposed garage. Mr. Knowles replied that traffic from the basement parking levels would exit on to California Street and that traffic from the above ground level would exit on to Cherry Street.

Commissioner Ritchie asked how high the proposed nursing wing will be when it is constructed. Mr. Knowles stated that plans had not yet been prepared for that structure.

Commissioner Ritchie asked the applicants if office space in the proposed building would be made available only to doctors who are on the staff of the hospital. A member of the Board of Directors of Childrens Hospital responded in the affirmative.

President Newman asked if any study had been made of the shadows which would be cast by the proposed building. Mr. Knowles replied in the negative. While he expected that the building would cast quite long shadows in the winter time, he doubted that the building would create any shadow problems during the summer season.

Mr. Passmore stated that he felt that the proposed building would shade most of the rear yard areas of houses immediately north of the subject site.

Mr. Moller stated that the hospital would "break even" if a building of the size of the one being proposed were to be constructed; however, he felt that it would be economically prohibitive to reduce the height of the building.

9/17/70

Robert Lilienthal, representing the Presidio Heights Association of Neighbors, read and submitted a statement which read, in part, as follows:

"The hospital representatives and their architects have redesigned the building so it has setbacks, following our suggestions at an earlier Commission meeting. We believe the design improves the appearance and allows more light to the north, but it naturally follows that more height is needed to compensate for the lost space. We hope that the height can be kept as low as possible.

"It would be our hope that the structure on the roof would be kept to a minimum. Although we recognize the need to house the elevator shaft and the air conditioning equipment neatly, we hope that the structure can be reduced from that shown in the design.

"It would appear that entering the garage will cause some problems in street traffic: many drivers will want to cross California Street from the south side, which should not be permitted, and others will need to make a U-turn at the corner. We trust the Planning Department will consult with the City's traffic department at an early stage to solve the problems."

Allen Mitchum, President of the Jordan Park Improvement Association, confirmed that the Hospital and its architects had stayed in touch with residents of the neighborhood as final plans for the proposed building were being prepared. However, he indicated that while the residents of the area preferred the plans which had been approved by the Commission in December, 1969, they were aware of the problems which the hospital had faced in arriving at a building which would be suitable to its needs; and they would be amenable to the type of building which was being proposed. However, since traffic congestion on California Street is already a serious problem, the residents of Jordan Park felt that it would be desirable if the entrance and exit to the parking garage could be relocated so that the burden of traffic might be shifted onto Sacramento Street instead of California Street.

Franklyn Lyons, a property owner in Jordan Park, felt that use of the subject property as a medical office building would be less detrimental to the neighborhood than use of the site for a large apartment building constructed in conformity with the zoning of the property; and he felt that the setbacks which were to be provided would make the building now being proposed preferable to the one which had been reviewed by the Commission last December. In his opinion, the hospital and its architects had come up with the best plan possible for the site; however, he suggested that the facade of the building should receive better treatment than had been illustrated on the plans. In conclusion, he stated that he was sorry that more consideration had not been given to the feasibility of using Sacramento Street for vehicular access to the proposed building.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

1. The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not intended to constitute an offer of insurance or any other financial product. It is provided for your information only and should not be relied upon as a basis for any investment decision. The information is based on the information provided to us by the issuer and is not intended to constitute an offer of insurance or any other financial product. It is provided for your information only and should not be relied upon as a basis for any investment decision.

[illegible][illegible]

1. The first of these is the fact that the United States has a long and distinguished history of leadership in the world. This leadership has been based on a combination of military, economic, and cultural power. The United States has been a leading power in the world since the end of the Second World War, and this leadership has been based on a combination of military, economic, and cultural power. The United States has been a leading power in the world since the end of the Second World War, and this leadership has been based on a combination of military, economic, and cultural power.

9/17/70

John Skov, owner of property on the south side of Sacramento Street in the subject block, noted that several of the properties fronting on Sacramento Street are developed with single family homes or flats; and he indicated that he and his neighbors would prefer to have the height of the proposed building reduced. While the setbacks being proposed might have been a good idea, the effectiveness of the rear setback would be minimal since the above-ground parking level would extend all the way to the rear property line. He believed that the proposed building would cast the rear yards of adjacent buildings in permanent shadow; and, for that reason, he felt that the 7-floor building originally planned for the site would be better than the 8 story building now being proposed.

Mr. Knowles remarked that the property owned by Mr. Skov does not directly abut the subject site. While he did not dispute the fact that the proposed building would cast shadows on adjacent parcels of property during the wintertime, he felt that the building would cast no shadows whatsoever on those yards during the summertime. He stated that the side setbacks had originally been suggested by Mr. Skov; and, in giving consideration to that suggestion, the architects in his firm had found that the setbacks would have a desirable effect on the plans for the building.

Mrs. Skov believed that shadow studies had been made on a scale model of the neighborhood; and she felt that it would be helpful if those studies could be reproduced for the Commission. Mr. Knowles replied that he did not have the model at hand; however, he did display sketches which he had prepared to illustrate the difference between the size of the proposed project and the size of an apartment building which could have been constructed on the site in conformance with the existing zoning. He stated that his firm had actually designed a 104,450 square foot apartment building for the site which would have been 10 stories tall with two floors of parking above ground. He remarked that such a building would have had a more detrimental effect on the adjacent property than the building being proposed.

Mr. Skov doubted that any developer would have so little concern for the neighborhood that he would construct the type of apartment building shown on the sketches which Mr. Knowles had displayed.

Mrs. Shelton, 3941 Sacramento Street, stated that she had purchased her house approximately 1 year ago and had done a lot of work on it; and, if the proposed building were to be constructed, it would cut off her view, would darken her backyard, and would affect her standard of living. She had no doubt but what the building would be constructed; however, in that case, she felt that it would be better to limit the building to a height of 6 floors rather than 7, 8 or 9 floors. Mrs. Shelton also remarked that she was concerned about the quality of the living environment in the immediate vicinity during the 18-month period when the proposed building will be under construction; however, she did not know what suggestions to make in that regard.

The first thing I noticed when I stepped out of the car was the cold. It was a sharp contrast to the warm blanket I had been sitting under. I looked around, trying to get my bearings. The street was empty, the only sound being the distant hum of traffic. I felt a sense of isolation, a feeling that I was alone in a vast, unfamiliar world. I took a deep breath, trying to steady myself. The air was crisp, almost invigorating. I knew I had to move forward, to face whatever lay ahead. I took a step, then another, and finally, I was walking. The world seemed to be waiting for me, its secrets hidden in the shadows of the trees and the corners of the buildings. I felt a mix of fear and excitement, a sense of adventure that had been dormant for so long. I was ready to take on whatever came my way.

As I walked, I noticed the details of the city. The architecture was a mix of old and new, with historic buildings standing alongside modern structures. The streets were clean, and the sidewalks were wide. I felt a sense of order, a feeling that everything was in its place. I saw people walking in the distance, their forms blurred by the distance. I felt a sense of connection, a feeling that I was part of something larger than myself. I took a turn to the right, following the curve of the street. The sun was low in the sky, casting a warm glow over the scene. I felt a sense of peace, a feeling that I was exactly where I needed to be. I took a deep breath, feeling the air fill my lungs. I was ready to take on whatever came my way.

I continued to walk, feeling the rhythm of my steps. The city was alive around me, its energy palpable. I saw a small shop with a sign that read "The Book Nook". I felt a sense of curiosity, a feeling that I wanted to know more. I turned down a side street, following the sound of a bell. The street was narrow, the buildings close together. I felt a sense of intimacy, a feeling that I was in a secret place. I saw a man sitting on a bench, his head bowed in his hands. I felt a sense of sympathy, a feeling that I wanted to help. I took a deep breath, feeling the air fill my lungs. I was ready to take on whatever came my way.

I walked on, feeling the pulse of the city. The sun had set, and the stars were beginning to appear. I felt a sense of wonder, a feeling that I was witnessing something magical. I took a turn to the left, following the sound of a bell. The street was narrow, the buildings close together. I felt a sense of intimacy, a feeling that I was in a secret place. I saw a man sitting on a bench, his head bowed in his hands. I felt a sense of sympathy, a feeling that I wanted to help. I took a deep breath, feeling the air fill my lungs. I was ready to take on whatever came my way.

I continued to walk, feeling the rhythm of my steps. The city was alive around me, its energy palpable. I saw a small shop with a sign that read "The Book Nook". I felt a sense of curiosity, a feeling that I wanted to know more. I turned down a side street, following the sound of a bell. The street was narrow, the buildings close together. I felt a sense of intimacy, a feeling that I was in a secret place. I saw a man sitting on a bench, his head bowed in his hands. I felt a sense of sympathy, a feeling that I wanted to help. I took a deep breath, feeling the air fill my lungs. I was ready to take on whatever came my way.

9/17/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the subject property, located on California Street, had been zoned R-4 since 1960; and he noted that the R-4 zoning classification would allow construction of a 10 story apartment building on the site. Although the property owned by Mrs. Shelton is zoned for a lesser density, under the circumstances, he felt that Mrs. Shelton should have been as much concerned about the zoning of adjacent parcels of property when she was considering purchase of her property which is located on Sacramento Street.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Porter, Mr. Murphy stated that the property owned by Mrs. Shelton is zoned R-3. Commissioner Porter then remarked that she did sympathize with people who purchase residential properties and who then find that the character of the neighborhood is slated for change; and, under the circumstances, she felt that Childrens Hospital should make every concession possible to render the proposed building less objectional to people living on Sacramento Street. In that regard, she wondered if it would be possible to abolish the front setback and to move the building forward on the site. Mr. Knowles stated that the elevator core for the proposed building must be placed in the center of the site in order to serve the sub-surface garage levels; and, as a result, it would not be possible to move the office building any further towards the front of the site.

Commissioner Ritchie asked Mrs. Shelton if anyone had advised her that a high rise building could be constructed on the subject site under its R-4 zoning classification before she had made a decision to purchase her property on Sacramento Street. Mrs. Shelton replied in the negative.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if the wall of the garage facing the rear yards of the building on Sacramento Street would be constructed of concrete. Mr. Knowles stated that the original proposal had been to leave the wall of the garage open so that adjacent property owners would be able to see through the building; however, the neighbors had indicated their objection to that proposal. Therefore, the plans had been changed to hide the garage behind a concrete wall.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that Mr. Lilienthal had urged that the size of the mechanical penthouse on top of the building be reduced, asked if such reduction would be possible. Mr. Knowles replied that Mr. Lilienthal had seen an earlier set of plans; and he indicated that the penthouse shown on the plans presently on display in the meeting room had been reduced to an absolute minimum.

Mr. Passmore stated that the earlier plans had included a storage room on top of the roof; however, the plans presently under consideration would provide penthouse space for elevator and mechanical equipment only.

Commissioner Ritchie, remarking that Mr. Lilienthal had also urged the staff of the Department of City Planning to consult with the traffic engineering bureau of the Department of Public Works in order to solve traffic problems which might be created by the proposed project, asked if those meetings would be held. Commissioner Porter replied that it is customary for the staff of the Department of City Planning to discuss traffic issues with the Department of Public Works.

9/17/70

Mr. Murphy recommended that the plans be approved subject to 5 specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which had been prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Passmore read and commented upon the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution. He also remarked that the applicants had made every effort to follow suggestions which had previously been offered by the staff of the Department of City Planning, including the recommendation for side setbacks and for reduction of floor to ceiling heights in the six upper floors. However, the applicants had not been able to place the garage levels deeper in the ground because the added depth would have made the ramps too steep.

Commissioner Porter inquired about the modified floor to ceiling height for the upper six stories. Mr. Knowles stated that the floor to ceiling height would be 11 feet six inches.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the draft resolution would require that the proposed building provide off-street parking spaces for at least 231 automobiles, asked how many parking spaces would ordinarily have been required by the City Planning Code for the project. Mr. Passmore replied that the Code requires 282 parking spaces for the proposed building. Of the required number of parking spaces, 231 would be provided in the building itself; and the remaining parking spaces would be made available in the existing parking garage adjacent to the subject site.

Commissioner Porter remarked that provision of 231 new parking spaces on the site would only serve to discourage people from using other means of transportation to arrive at the hospital.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that Mr. Lyons had suggested that the proposed building should receive a more attractive facade treatment than that indicated on the renderings, asked if the staff would discuss that matter with the applicants. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative, noting that condition No. 2 of the draft resolution provided that final plans for the project must be approved by the Department of City Planning before application is made for any building permits, with special attention to be given to surface treatment and color, attractive architectural treatment of all exposed property line walls, landscaping and screening of the parking deck from California Street and adjacent properties.

Commissioner Porter, remarking that previous speakers had suggested that it would be desirable to use Sacramento Street for vehicular access to and egress from the garage, asked why a decision had been made to funnel the traffic onto California Street. Mr. Passmore replied that the decision to place the entrance of the garage on California Street had been made at an early date because of the lower density developments and the school which are located on Sacramento Street.

The first step in the process of the development of the program is the selection of the subject matter to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution.

The second step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

The third step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

The fourth step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

The fifth step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

The sixth step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

The seventh step is the selection of the material to be covered. This is done by the committee on the subject matter, which is composed of representatives of the various departments of the institution. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered. The committee on the subject matter is also responsible for the selection of the material to be covered.

9/17/70

President Newman asked if there would be a restriction on the maximum height of the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Passmore replied that the City Planning Code establishes a maximum - a height of 16 feet for such a structure; however, he was hopeful that the proposed penthouse would be below that height.

President Newman asked the applicant if the conditions contained in the draft resolution were satisfactory. Mr. Moller replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Ritchie, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6629 and that the preliminary final plans for the project be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

At 4:00 p.m. President Newman announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:10 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

LM70.2 - Consideration of proposal to designate the Feusier Octagon House at 1067 Green Street as a Landmark.

Ralph A. Mead, Secretary of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, summarized the architectural and historical attributes of the subject building which were described in detail in a case report which had previously been sent to members of the Commission and which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. He stated that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board considered the subject building to be one of the most important buildings which it had recommended for landmark status since it is one of the oldest buildings on Russian Hill and since it is an historical as well as an architectural landmark.

On the request of President Newman, Donald Stover, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, reviewed the effect which landmarks designation would have on the subject property.

Franklyn H. Lyons, a certified property manager, urged that the subject building be designated as a landmark.

The Secretary called attention to correspondence which had been received from the California Historical Society; from Herbert Hoover, Past President of the California Heritage Council; from Louise Mendelsohn; from Harold and Marian Wallace; from the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; and from San Francisco Beautiful in support of the proposed designation of the Feusier Octagon House as a Landmark.

Myron R. Meyer, part owner of the subject property, advised the Commission that his attorney had been unable to attend the hearing. While he and his partner had attempted to maintain the property in an attractive manner, the house, which was constructed 112 years ago, has many structural problems. Furthermore, the house occupies only a portion of the property which he and his partner own in the

9/17/70

neighborhood; and they had anticipated using the combined sites to construct a high-rise building. While he agreed that it would be desirable to preserve the Octagon House, he did not feel that such an objective would be economically feasible for him. Since his attorney had not been able to be present to represent him, he urged that the matter be sent back to the Landmarks Board so that the question of preservation could be explored further.

Commissioner Porter felt that it would not be proper to refer the matter back to the Landmarks Board; however, it would be possible for the Commission to postpone action on the matter until a later date.

Mr. Mead stated that decisions are supposed to be made on the proposed designation of landmarks within a six month period; and, since the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board had begun to consider the Feuiser Octagon House, in June, time was running somewhat short. Under the circumstances, he suggested that action on the matter be postponed for only one week.

Mr. Meyers felt that a one month postponement would be more desirable.

Commissioner Rueda, noting that designation of the building as a landmark would prohibit any "substantial changes" of the structure, asked how that term could be defined. Mr. Stover remarked that any alteration requiring a building permit would be considered a "substantial change". Mr. Mead emphasized that designation of the building as a Landmark would not affect alterations proposed for the interior of the building or normal repair and maintenance projects.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Fleishhacker absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Stover stated that it would be difficult for the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board to analyze the structural condition of the building without benefit of professional assistance, even if action on the matter were to be postponed by the Commission.

Mr. Lyons, who had spoken earlier urging that the building be designated as a Landmark, stated that he would favor such action only if designation were desired by the owners.

Commissioner Porter felt that the subject building is a Landmark if any building in San Francisco is worthy of that designation; and she felt that the Commission should not postpone action on the matter for any great length of time. In any case, even if the building were to be designated as a Landmark, the maximum amount of time which issuance of a demolition permit could be delayed would be one year.

9/17/70

Mrs. Peter Platt, a member of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that the architect members of the Board felt that a new building could be designed for the site which would allow the Octagon House to be preserved; and in any case, it would probably take longer to prepare plans for a high-rise building on the site than the six month or one year period during which the demolition permit could be held by the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Rueda, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that further consideration of the proposal be postponed until the meeting of October 1, 1970, at 1:00 p.m.

LM70.3 - Consideration of proposal to designate the Stadtmuller House at 819 Eddy Street as a Landmark.

Ralph A. Mead, Secretary of the Landmarks Preservation and Advisory Board, summarized both the history and the architectural features of the subject building. A more detailed description is available in the case report which had previously been presented to the members of the Commission and which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. In conclusion, Mr. Mead advised the Commission that subject property had recently been sold and that it is presently being used for law offices.

Alan Axelrod, attorney for the owners of the subject property, stated that his clients supported the recommendation of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board that the building be designated as a Landmark.

Commissioner Ritchie, noting that the subject property is located within Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2, asked if the Redevelopment Agency had agreed to retain the subject building. Mrs. Platt replied in the affirmative.

Michael Stephanian, one of the owners of the subject property, stated that he had attended school in Boston and had seen one of that city's oldest and most beautiful neighborhoods leveled for redevelopment; and he was anxious to do whatever he could to prevent the same thing from happening in San Francisco.

Commissioner Ritchie asked if any arrangements had been made by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board for the placement of plaques on buildings which have been designated as Landmarks. Mr. Mead replied in the negative.

...the
... ..
... ..
... ..

The following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

On July 10, 1968, at New York City, New York, the following information was obtained from the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]

...the
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to collect data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to analyze the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to interpret the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to draw conclusions. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to report the findings. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to discuss the implications. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to write the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to submit the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to publish the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to disseminate the findings. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to evaluate the process. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to improve the process. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to repeat the process. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to continue the process. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The next step is to end the process. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study.

[illegible]

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific information required.

9/17/70

Mr. Stephanian stated that he and his partner would not want to have a plaque on their building.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Ritchie, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6630 be adopted and that the proposal to designate the Stadtmuller House as a Landmark be approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Plo
Secretary

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem.

2. The second part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

3. The third part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

4. The fourth part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

5. The fifth part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

6. The sixth part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

7. The seventh part is devoted to a detailed analysis of the problem.

SECRETARY'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting held Thursday, September 24, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 24, 1970, at 2:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman, President.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator); Richard Hedman, Planner V - Urban Design; William Proctor, Planner IV; James Paul, Planner III - Housing Specialist; DeWayne Guyer, Planner II - Urban Design; Walter Stoll, Planner III - Transportation; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of August 27, 1970, be approved as submitted.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Ritchie arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reminded the members of the Commission of the Public Hearing on the Improvement Plan for Residence which has been scheduled for next Monday evening, September 28, at 7:30 p.m. in the Auditorium of the Frank McCoppin Elementary School at 646 - 7th Avenue.

The Director advised the Commission that the first meeting of the Chinatown Citizen's Advisory Committee will be held on Friday, September 25, at 3:00 p.m. in the offices of the Department of City Planning.

The Director recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which would authorize him to request a supplemental budget request in the amount of \$5,030 for the purchase of dictating equipment, for official travel and for the re-hiring on an intermittent consulting basis of a retired employee of the Department of City Planning.

THE BOARD

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Members of the Board of Directors: (List of names)

The Board of Directors is composed of the following members: (List of names)

Members of the Board of Directors: (List of names)

Members of the Board of Directors: (List of names)

The Board of Directors is composed of the following members: (List of names)

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

It was moved by the Chairman of the Board that the Board of Directors be authorized to (List of actions)

At this point in the proceedings, the Chairman of the Board assumed his seat at the Chairman's table.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

At this point in the proceedings, the Chairman of the Board assumed his seat at the Chairman's table.

The Chairman of the Board of Directors is (List of names)

The Board of Directors is composed of the following members: (List of names)

9/24/70

After discussion, it was moved by Commission Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Rueda, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6631.

Commissioner Porter advised the Commission that a letter had been received from the Ecology Center and Sunflower Bookstore requesting the Commission to become a co-sponsor for a "Festival of Bikes" program to be conducted during October. After discussion, the Commission requested the Secretary to prepare a response wishing the program success but advising that it has been the policy of the Commission not to sponsor private activities and programs.

Richard Hedman, Planner V, presented a "Festival" proposal for celebrating San Francisco and the Nation's bicentennial. The Festival would be aimed at improving environment; creating new parks and open space; improving public access to parks, museums and other public facilities; and creating jobs and training people who need those jobs so that they can hold them. Emphasis would be placed on permanent improvements. Many existing and planned attractions would be linked together by a Festival transit system which would also serve a functional purpose for the community as well.

R70.63 Sutter-Stockton Garage expansion to include 585 Bush Street.

and

R70.71 Acquisition of property for Department of Social Services.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation (Zoning Administrator), reported on this matter as follows:

"Pursuant to Section 116.1 of the Charter, the subject referrals have been received from the Director of the Parking Authority and the Director of Property, respectively.

"The proposal is to enlarge the Sutter-Stockton garage by the use of the site of the Department of Social Services building at 585 Bush Street, a 137.5-foot square lot at the southeast corner of Stockton and Bush Streets, (Lot 17, Block 286) which is bounded on the other two sides by the present garage. The financing of the garage addition and the provision of relocated facilities for the Department of Social Services would be accomplished by means of non-profit corporations.

"The Uptown Parking Corporation, which built the Sutter-Stockton garage and which would expand it, proposes to pay \$1,000,000 for the Bush Street site which would be used for City purchase of new sites for the Department of Social Services near their present offices at 1680 Mission and 150 Otis Streets.

9/24/70

"A new non-profit corporation, the City of San Francisco Social Services Corporation, would lease the new sites from the City and do the necessary reconstruction and remodeling work estimated at a cost of \$4,345,000, financed by the corporation's bonds. After the new sites are ready for occupancy, the corporation would lease them back to the City at an estimated rental of \$398,000 a year. When the bonds have been retired, title to the facilities will be given to the City. Federal subventions will pay about half of the rent.

"The proposed new sites for the Department of Social Services, in the vicinity of City-owned buildings it already occupies at 150 Otis Street and 1680 Mission Street, are: 1661, 1663-65 and 1673 Mission Street (respectively, Lots 31, 30 and 29, Block 3514), and 166-170 Otis Street (Lot 8, Block 3513). The City Planning Commission reviewed a project in the 1970-71 Capital Improvement Program for a bond issue for acquisition and development of the three lots on Mission Street for the Department of Social Services, finding it in conformity with the Master Plan and giving it an "A" priority. That project and the present proposal are the same in that the building at 1663-65 Mission Street would be remodeled and Lot 31 would be cleared for a parking lot; however, Lot 29 would also become a parking lot under the present proposal, instead of a parking garage as under the capital improvement project.

"The acquisition of 166-170 Otis Street, just south of 150 Otis, has not been previously reviewed by the City Planning Commission. Under the non-profit corporation's proposal, the top floor of the three story building would be remodeled for offices and the ground floor for parking. It has not yet been determined whether the second floor should be used for offices or parking. After the new sites are remodeled, the Department of Social Services would be able to move from quarters it now rents at 965 and 1360 Mission Street, as well as from 585 Bush Street.

"Use of the Social Services building site at 585 Bush Street for expansion of the Sutter-Stockton garage has been contemplated for some time by the Parking Authority, the Division of Traffic Engineering of the Department of Public Works and the Department of City Planning. Reports of this Department have indicated the appropriateness of the site. In fact, the site was included in the City Planning Commission's original Master Plan review of the Sutter-Stockton garage in 1956. Schematic plans submitted with this referral show approximately 500 car spaces added to the 870 now in the Sutter-Stockton garage, an addition that can be made without acquisition of private property.

9/24/70

"The plans for the garage addition have been reviewed by the Department with the architects, Sokoloff, Hamilton and Blewett, and with the engineers, H. J. Degenkolb and Associates, and the plans now represent what the various parties intend to build when the site becomes available.

"The site is in the downtown zoning districts, at the edge of the C-3-G (Downtown General Commercial) district bordering the C-3-R (Downtown Retail) district. In C-3 districts all public and private garages must be reviewed by the City Planning Commission under the criteria set out in Section 143 of the City Planning Code, as follows:

1. Accessibility to the area of the proposed site and to the proposed parking garage itself, from freeway ramps or from major thoroughfares;
2. Convenient service to areas of concentrated development, particularly those within the C-3-O and C-3-R districts, by location of the proposed parking garage near or adjacent to but not inside such concentrated areas;
3. Minimization of conflict of the proposed parking garage with pedestrian movements and amenities, resulting from the placement of driveways and ramps, the breaking of continuity of shopping facilities along sidewalks, and the drawing of traffic through areas of heavy pedestrian concentration;
4. The service patterns of other forms of transportation;
5. The Transportation Section of the Master Plan; and
6. Such other criteria as may be deemed appropriate in the circumstances of the particular case.

"With respect to these criteria, the site is well located on the east-west access corridor of Bush and Pine Streets, and provides good service to the high priority parking need of the retail district without penetration of automobiles into the area of concentrated development and heavy pedestrian activity. The location is a peripheral one with respect to the area of convenient access from the Market Street subway. In view of the appropriateness of the location, the major points for comment concern the efficient functioning of the garage addition and the effects of its design upon nearby properties and streets.

9/24/70

"The schematic plans have taken these points into account, and further recognition of them can be given as the plans are refined. The most significant aspects of the garage design are as follows:

1. The addition would be three and one-half levels higher than the existing garage, which has eight levels. This general scale is appropriate;
2. Exterior treatment of the addition is such as to differentiate it to a degree from the appearance of the existing garage. This differentiation will help to reduce the apparent massiveness of the total structure, in keeping with the moderate scale of nearby buildings. To provide texture for the building surfaces, ribbed and chipped concrete panels and railings and exposed aggregate columns and beams would be appropriate;
3. Solid screening should be provided in the wall openings to shield headlights and obscure the automobiles. A degree of screening should also be provided on both the new and the old roof areas. Ceiling lighting in the new portion of the structure should be shielded from the streets and other buildings;
4. Landscaping is shown and should be provided in generous quantities. Adequate provision should be made for watering and other maintenance of this landscaping;
5. The extensive wall at ground level along Stockton Street requires close attention to avoid a sterile and imposing appearance. Texturing and glare-free floodlighting of this wall are desirable means of treatment;
6. A turning lane is shown along Bush Street for entrance to the garage, and this lane should be provided. The lane should begin just east of the Stockton Street tunnel, so as to avoid changes in the present tunnel portal. Parking should be prohibited in the turning lane;

The following points have been taken into account, and the following recommendations are made to the Board of Directors. The recommendations are based on the findings of the study.

1. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's operations, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

2. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's financial affairs, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

3. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's personnel, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

4. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's legal affairs, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

5. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's general affairs, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

6. The Board of Directors should be given the authority to make decisions on all matters relating to the company's general affairs, and to appoint and dismiss the management.

7. Every effort should be made to improve the operation of the garage, especially in terms of in-and-out circulation. All entrances and exits should be used, with as much emphasis as possible upon entrances from Bush Street and exits over the elevated ramp above Stockton Street to connect with Pine Street; such emphasis would make the best use of the Bush-Pine one-way system and avoid further congestion in the retail area. Elevator service for patrons should be improved and an adequate number of personnel should be provided, including cashiers. Monthly parking should be minimized;

8. Any signs proposed to be used should be submitted to the Department of City Planning Staff for review.

"Continued staff review as the garage plans are being developed would be valuable in view of all of the aforementioned concerns. Such review could be assured by adding a clause providing for it in the proposed Joint Working Agreement between the City and the Parking Authority."

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended that the proposed expansion of the Sutter-Stockton garage to include the 585 Bush Street site be approved as being in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that preliminary and final plans for the garage addition, landscaping, and the associated vehicle circulation would be submitted to the Department of City Planning and the Division of Traffic Engineering, Department of Public Works, for review. It was further recommended that a similar clause should be added to the joint working agreement between the City and the Parking Authority at the earliest possible date. The Director also recommended that the acquisition of 166 - 170 Otis Street for use by the Department of Social Services be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Edward Keil, attorney for both the Uptown Parking Corp. and the City of San Francisco Social Services Corp., stated that the conditions being recommended would be acceptable to his clients. He also remarked that construction of the garage expansion could not be initiated until the Social Services Department has moved into its new quarters; and he assured the Commission that every effort would be made to work new technological changes into the plans for the garage expansion during the interim.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if an entrance to the garage addition would be provided from Bush Street. Mr. Steele replied that no new entrances or exits were being proposed. He stated that the two buildings would be integrated at certain locations; and two new elevators would be included in the new wing.

1. The first object of the present Convention is to secure the
the highest possible degree of uniformity in the
the various countries and to this end it is
that with a view to the attainment of this object
the various countries should be invited to
their respective laws and to make such changes
as may be necessary to bring them into
conformity with the provisions of the Convention.
The Convention shall be open for signature
by any country which is a member of the League of Nations
and by any country which is invited to do so by the
League of Nations.

2. Any country which is not a member of the League of Nations
may also become a party to the Convention.

The Convention shall be open for signature by any country which
is a member of the League of Nations and by any country which
is invited to do so by the League of Nations.

Article 1. The Convention shall be open for signature by any
country which is a member of the League of Nations and by any
country which is invited to do so by the League of Nations.
The Convention shall be open for signature by any country which
is a member of the League of Nations and by any country which
is invited to do so by the League of Nations.

Article 2. The Convention shall be open for signature by any
country which is a member of the League of Nations and by any
country which is invited to do so by the League of Nations.

Article 3. The Convention shall be open for signature by any
country which is a member of the League of Nations and by any
country which is invited to do so by the League of Nations.

9/24/70

He remarked that certain existing entrances and exits to the garage are occasionally unused.

Mr. Keil stated that the original garage has been designed to accommodate expansion onto the 585 Bush Street site; and, as a result, it already has more than sufficient ramps and other facilities to serve the proposed addition.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the proposed addition would facilitate more efficient operation of the garage.

Mr. Keil replied in the affirmative. He also remarked that the proposed addition would increase revenue for operators of the garage as well as placing the subject property back on the tax rolls.

Ronald Born, Director of the Social Services Department, indicated that he was satisfied with the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning. He indicated that the Social Services Commission had favored consolidation of their facilities in the Mission and Otis Street location since 1964; however, the proposal had never been submitted in the form of a bond issue. He stated that the Social Services Commission presently pays an annual rental of approximately \$343,000. If the subject proposal were to be approved, his Commission would pay approximately \$398,000 annually for rental fees for a period of 25 years; and at the end of that time, title to the property would revert to the City free and clear. He also advised the Commission that the Federal Government would contribute approximately 50% of the rental fees which would be required.

Mr. Keil assured the Commission that remodeling of the new offices for the Social Services Commission would be carried out by appropriate city agencies even though the City of San Francisco's Social Services Corp., a private non-profit corporation, would be in charge of the project.

Mr. Born stated that the Federal Government had contributed 50% of the cost of the facility at 585 Bush Street. Therefore, if the money to be obtained from the sale of that property were not to be used for new quarters, a portion of it would have to be returned to the Federal Government.

Commissioner Ritchie stated that he represented the real estate firm which was handling negotiations for the property at 166 - 170 Otis Street; and, therefore, he intended to abstain from voting on the matters under consideration.

Lewis Lindsay, representing the Transportation Committee of the Citizens Planning Committee, felt that it would be more appropriate to use the property at 585 Bush Street for some use other than a parking garage for automobiles.

and many others. This has been the result of the fact that the
the following information is being provided to you:

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or goal. This involves understanding the current situation and what needs to be achieved.

[illegible]

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to determine the nature of the problem. This involves a thorough understanding of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the nature of the problem is understood, the next step is to identify the causes of the problem. This involves a detailed analysis of the situation and the factors that are contributing to the problem. Once the causes of the problem are identified, the next step is to develop a plan of action to address the problem. This involves determining the steps that need to be taken to solve the problem and the resources that will be required to implement the plan. Finally, the last step in the process is to implement the plan and monitor the results. This involves putting the plan into action and tracking the progress of the solution to ensure that the problem is resolved.

9/24/70

The Director remarked that the property at 585 Bush Street is located on the fringe of the Downtown District; and, therefore, he felt that use of the site for parking would be quite appropriate.

Mr. Lindsay stated that the new garage which was recently constructed by the Hearst Corporation south of Market Street is not used to capacity. He felt that lack of patronage at that garage was indicative of the fact that automobile parking is a declining business; and he believed that the property at 585 Bush Street should not be used for a garage.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed expansion of the Sutter-Stockton garage to include the 585 Bush Street site, lot 17 Block 286, is in conformity with the Master Plan provided that preliminary and final plans for the garage addition, landscaping and the associated vehicle circulation shall be submitted to the Department of City Planning and the Division of Traffic Engineering, Department of Public Works, for review. It was further recommended that such a clause be added to the joint working agreement between the City and the Parking Authorities at the earliest possible date. Commissioner Ritchie abstained from voting.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the acquisition of 166 - 170 Otis Street, Lot 8 Block 3513, for use by the Department of Social Services is in conformity with the Master Plan. Commissioner Ritchie abstained from voting.

At 2:55 p.m. acting Chairman Porter announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, reconvened at 3:00 P.M. for the remainder of the agenda.

3:00 P.M. Room 282 City Hall

Public Hearing to consider route and design criteria for any freeway which might be constructed in the Golden Gate-Northern Waterfront Corridor (Route 480).

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on this matter as follows:

"In October 1969 the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors in Resolution 761-69 requested the State Division of Highways to stop work on the elevated freeway connection between the new Southern Embarcadero Extension (Interstate Route 280) and the existing elevated Embarcadero Freeway. This was in response to widespread concern that

9/24/70

such a connection would perpetuate the use of the existing elevated freeway, contrary to the stated City policy that the Embarcadero Freeway plus any connection to the Golden Gate Bridge be underground.

"As a result of this action Gordon C. Luce, State Secretary of Transportation, requested ABAG through its Regional Transportation Planning Committee to work with the City of San Francisco and the State Division of highways to develop an acceptable solution to the "freeway problem" in the Golden Gate-Northern Waterfront corridor.

"On May 7, 1970, Mayor Alioto requested the City Planning Department's assistance in developing criteria and possible routings for a freeway connection between the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge. In response to this request and after advising the Commission of suggested criteria and alternative routes, I presented a statement to the Regional Transportation Planning Committee on July 15, 1970, copies of which were given to this Commission.

"While the Regional Transportation Planning Committee seemed responsive to my statement, the Committee felt that unless the proposed objectives and criteria had some official City endorsement or general concurrence it could not recommend them to the State as a beginning point for negotiations. Today's Public Hearing was scheduled at the request of this Commission to give the citizens of San Francisco an opportunity to express their feelings on this vital civic issue, prior to possible action by the Commission.

"I am sure you are all familiar with the past proposals for this route and I will not dwell upon them. The first point of consideration should be what is the function of this route? Although this route has always been talked about as a connection between the two Bridges and as a missing link in the freeway system between the Peninsula and the North Bay, I do not believe that this is its basic function.

"The Golden Gate Corridor route, including the Embarcadero Freeway, functions as a distributor to San Francisco's downtown. It brings East Bay travelers to the area North of Market Street. It serves Peninsula vehicles on the James Lick and Southern-Embarcadero Freeways the same way. Automobiles from the North Bay presently use city arterials to reach the downtown, and if a new limited access roadway were built, the traffic from the Golden Gate Bridge using it would also be primarily destined for our downtown.

9/24/70

"Traffic both from the East Bay and the Peninsula to the North Bay along the Golden Gate Corridor going through downtown San Francisco does not presently represent a significant amount of the total traffic, nor is it likely to in the future. This route for most of such trips would not be the most direct. In summary, the traffic on a Golden Gate Corridor route is destined for downtown San Francisco and not through it and should be viewed in this context.

"I view both a long-range rapid transit line to the North Bay and a Golden Gate - Northern Waterfront corridor arterial as ultimate transportation goals. Rapid transit has the higher priority but it will take longer to fully implement. The improved mass transit system of buses and ferries presently being developed is a major stride toward establishing a strong transit habit between San Francisco and the North Bay.

"It would seem that San Francisco would have four primary objectives to achieve if a limited access roadway facility is built in this corridor.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| <u>Objective I</u> | A limited access facility should preserve and enhance the environment of the area through which it passes. |
| <u>Objective II</u> | A facility must improve the appearance of the Northern Waterfront from the Ferry Building to the Golden Gate Bridge. |
| <u>Objective III</u> | Any new roadway must relieve surface traffic congestion in the Marina and North Beach Districts and on Marina Boulevard, Lombard, Bay and North Point Streets in particular. |
| <u>Objective IV</u> | The plan for a new roadway must be realistic in its components and in the staging of construction. |

"To achieve these objectives a plan for Route 480 should also conform to the following policies and design criteria:

1. The connection must be basically below grade from The Presidio to downtown San Francisco and must include the removal of the existing elevated Embarcadero Freeway.

9/24/70

2. Since existing capacity constraints on the Golden Gate Bridge and on U. S. 101 in Marin County preclude substantial increases in the number of commuter vehicles entering San Francisco from the North Bay, the effect of an improved Route 480 should be to take traffic off of the streets in the Marina and in North Beach rather than stimulating more vehicular traffic to downtown from North Bay points. The controlling factor in the design capacity of a new facility should be the existing capacity of the Golden Gate Bridge, less those vehicles which use Park Presidio Boulevard. We do not desire a second deck for automobiles to be constructed on the Golden Gate Bridge.
3. As the route is considered a bypass facility carrying vehicles directly from The Presidio to downtown, the location and capacity of entrance and exit ramps in the Marina and North Beach should be designed to prevent through traffic from using district streets. The existing major district arterials should function as local circulation facilities and as downtown access routes for residents of these districts.
4. We conceive the project to be built beneath existing public property so that there would be no residential displacement, or tunneled beneath private property at such a depth that the existing surface development remains undisturbed. Bored tunneling where feasible and decked open-cut construction methods should be employed to assure the least general disruption and to permit full existing vehicular circulation capacity and transit service to be maintained during construction."

The Director then remarked that several possible schemes could be devised to obtain the objectives and design criteria which he was recommending for the Golden Gate Corridor and which would also achieve the State's desire for a limited access roadway between the two bridges; and he indicated that two alternative schemes have been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning as depicted on maps which were posted on the wall of the meeting room. One of the schemes would involve construction of a bored tunnel beneath the Marina and beneath Russian and Telegraph Hills to link the two bridges. The second scheme would consist of a tunnel through the Marina District and a depressed roadway along the alignment of Bay and North Point Streets and the Maritime Parkway.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if both of the alternatives would involve the same destinations and if they would include a Maritime Parkway at grade. The Director replied in the affirmative and remarked that both alternatives, involving either a bored tunnel or use of existing rights-of-way, would conform to the criteria being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, that existing housing or other developments should not be removed to accommodate new freeways.

It was further recommended that the following
 recommendations be made to the Board of Directors
 of the Corporation in order that the Corporation
 should be able to carry out the program of
 the Board of Directors in the most efficient
 manner possible. It was further recommended
 that the Board of Directors should be authorized
 to make such changes in the program as may be
 deemed necessary from time to time.

It was further recommended that the Board of Directors
 should be authorized to make such changes in the
 program as may be deemed necessary from time to
 time. It was further recommended that the Board
 of Directors should be authorized to make such
 changes in the program as may be deemed necessary
 from time to time.

It was further recommended that the Board of Directors
 should be authorized to make such changes in the
 program as may be deemed necessary from time to
 time. It was further recommended that the Board
 of Directors should be authorized to make such
 changes in the program as may be deemed necessary
 from time to time.

The Board of Directors should be authorized to make
 such changes in the program as may be deemed
 necessary from time to time. It was further
 recommended that the Board of Directors should
 be authorized to make such changes in the program
 as may be deemed necessary from time to time.

It was further recommended that the Board of Directors
 should be authorized to make such changes in the
 program as may be deemed necessary from time to
 time. It was further recommended that the Board
 of Directors should be authorized to make such
 changes in the program as may be deemed necessary
 from time to time.

9/24/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning had been based on the assumption that the link between the two bridges would serve through traffic only to a minor degree, asked for an explanation of the data on which that assumption had been based. The Director replied that the data available to the staff of the Department of City Planning had indicated that most of the traffic coming to San Francisco across the Bay Bridge is destined for Downtown San Francisco or for points south; and, in any case, it did not seem desirable to channel through traffic to Marin County through Downtown San Francisco. With regard to traffic originating in or directed to Marin County, he felt that the existing capacity of the Golden Gate Bridge should serve as the criteria for the capacity of any freeway to be constructed through the waterfront. He did not feel that construction of a second deck on the Golden Gate Bridge for automobile traffic would be in the best interests of San Francisco; and, therefore, he believed that it would be undesirable to construct a freeway through the Northern Waterfront which would accommodate a greater volume of traffic than that now carried on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if construction of a second deck on the Golden Gate Bridge for buses would increase the capacity for automobiles on the top deck. The Director replied that the capacity for automobile traffic would be increased only slightly under those circumstances; and, he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would urge that any additions to the Golden Gate Bridge be used exclusively for buses.

Commissioner Mellon asked if it were not the position of the Federal Bureau of Roads that a link is needed between the two bridges to accommodate through traffic. The Director stated that such a position may have been taken by the Federal Government to justify construction of the freeway; however, it was his opinion that the freeway, if built, would be used primarily by traffic going to and from downtown. In any case, such a freeway would serve the needs of any motorists who might wish to travel through the city without stopping.

Commissioner Rueda asked if any proposal were under consideration to accommodate traffic coming off the Golden Gate Bridge and wishing to continue southbound towards Junipero Serra Freeway. The Director estimated that only 3% of the traffic crossing the Golden Gate Bridge is destined for points south of San Francisco; however, even if the volume of such traffic were greater, the staff of the Department of City Planning would not recommend a freeway link between the Golden Gate Bridge and the Junipero Serra Freeway since such a freeway route would be extremely destructive to the City. He noted, however, that any freeway route through the waterfront could be used by southbound traffic to connect with the Southern Freeway if motorists would accept such a round-about route.

Commissioner Porter asked if the criteria being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning had been discussed with the State Division of Highways and if any indication had been given by the State as to whether it would be feasible to meet the criteria. The Director replied that the State was aware of the criteria which were being recommended; however, the State had not yet made

9/24/70

any formal comments regarding the criteria. He noted, however, that the Chairman of the Regional Transportation Planning Committee of ABAG had observed that any freeway meeting the criteria being proposed would be vastly more expensive than the type of freeway usually constructed by the State; and, as a result, such a freeway would involve expenditures which would ordinarily be allocated towards construction of freeways in other portions of the State. In response to that statement, he had replied that finances would have to be the concern of the State rather than the City and that the City's primary interest would have to be stated in terms of proper design.

Commissioner Porter, noting that both of the schematic alternatives which were on display in the room would involve removal of part of the existing elevated Embarcadero Freeway, asked if the other criteria being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning could be divorced from the criterion that a portion of the elevated freeway should be removed. The Director replied that removal of portions of the elevated Embarcadero Freeway was considered by the staff of the Department of City Planning to be a basic criterion to be met before further steps are taken to construct a freeway through the Northern Waterfront; however, he noted that the Board of Supervisors would ultimately be responsible for approving or disapproving any proposal offered by the State. While he could not predict the future policy of the Board of Supervisors, he did note that the Board had adopted a resolution in 1969 requesting the State to stop work on a freeway project which would have memorialized retention of the existing elevated Embarcadero Freeway.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that a statement should be made to explain why the staff of the Department of City Planning did not look favorably upon a direct freeway connection between the Golden Gate Bridge and the Junipero Serra Freeway. The Director replied that any freeway link between the Golden Gate Bridge and the Junipero Serra Freeway would involve a massive clearance program which would cause major disruptions in the City unless such a freeway were to be constructed as a bored tunnel; and he questioned the feasibility of constructing a seven-mile long tunnel through the City. In any case, he doubted whether such a route would serve any real purpose.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that a freeway route through the Northern Waterfront would serve southbound traffic in a round-about fashion; and, since it was estimated that only three percent of the traffic crossing the Golden Gate Bridge is directed to or from points south of San Francisco, he felt that such a route would fulfill needs for motorists wishing a freeway link with the Junipero Serra Freeway.

Commissioner Rueda remarked that any freeway to be constructed through the Northern Waterfront should have a sufficient capacity so that it would not have to be widened in the future if no direct connection between the Golden Gate Bridge and the Junipero Serra Freeway were contemplated. The Director replied that the position of the staff of the Department of City Planning was that any freeway to be constructed through the Northern Waterfront should not exceed the existing capacity of the Golden Gate Bridge since construction of a freeway with a greater capacity would inevitably be used as an argument for construction of another bridge or

9/24/70

another type of facility to expand the volume of traffic between San Francisco and Marin County.

Gene Morzenti, representing the Telegraph Hill Survival Association, stated that he also represented five schools and a number of merchants in the North Beach area who had supported his organization's proposal for turning Bay and North Point Streets into a one-way pair. While the report of the Director of Planning had remarked on the long history of dispute between the City and the State regarding construction of freeways in San Francisco, he noted that not a single foot of freeway had been constructed in San Francisco without the approval of the City; and, therefore, if freeways had been constructed which are now considered undesirable, he felt that the blame should be shared equally by the City and the State. While he felt that many of the criteria being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning would be desirable, he regretted that most of the recommendations of the staff were based on the false assumption that the elevated Embarcadero Freeway would be demolished. He stated that he had opposed the Embarcadero elevated freeway before it was constructed; however, his opposition was countered with statements to the effect that it would have been too expensive to construct the freeway below grade. Now that the elevated freeway has been constructed, he believed that it would be unrealistic to expect that it would be removed since its demolition would cost a great deal of money which is needed to solve more important problems. While he felt that demolition of the elevated Embarcadero Freeway, as well as the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges, might solve the traffic problems currently being experienced in the vicinity of Telegraph Hill, he did not feel that such a solution would be practical. And, while he agreed with the third objective stated by the staff of the Department of City Planning to the effect that any new freeway to be constructed through the Northern Waterfront should relieve surface traffic congestion in the North Beach area, he felt that the priorities established in the two alternative schemes which were on display in the meeting room should be re-ordered. During stage one, he felt that first priority should be given to turning the Bay and North Point Streets into a one-way pair since the result of such action would be to give immediate relief in the area without requiring any great expenditure of funds. Second priority should be given to construction of a depressed Maritime Parkway; and connection of that parkway with the south end of the Embarcadero Freeway should be given third priority. Fourth priority should be given to bringing the ramps of the Southern Freeway down to grade at Howard Street so that no encouragement would be given to bringing more traffic through the Telegraph Hill neighborhood. During phase two, he felt that a freeway link would have to be constructed between the two bridges; however, when such a link is constructed, he felt that its use should be restricted by tolls or other devices so that it would not increase the volume of traffic to the point where additional facilities would be needed. In conclusion, he remarked that the more outstanding cities of the world have developed peripheral traffic arteries rather than freeways which traverse their centers; and he felt that any new freeway to be constructed in San Francisco should be limited to the perimeter of the City rather than being placed through the center of the City.

9/24/70

Mrs. Arthur Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street, stated that she had not received any notice of the present hearing; and she felt that more wide-spread notice of such a hearing should be given if the Commission really wished to be appraised of the sentiment of the public. She remarked that the community had already rejected a freeway link between the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges; and she did not understand why the issue was being raised again. If such a freeway were to be constructed, it would only encourage more traffic to come through San Francisco instead of going directly to the East Bay from Marin County; and, if Federal funds are available for construction of a new freeway, she felt that it would be better to use the funds for things that San Francisco really needs. San Francisco is already flooded with traffic; and she felt that the best approach for the City to take would be to follow Montreal's example and to prohibit parking in the City so that people would be encouraged to use rapid transit.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been directed to recommend criteria for the construction of a new freeway through the Northern Waterfront; and she noted that the criteria being proposed by the staff involved demolition of the elevated Embarcadero Freeway and undergrounding of any new freeways to be constructed so that surface traffic would not become further congested. Mrs. Bierman stated that she did not understand why the staff of the Department of City Planning had been requested to develop criteria for a new freeway.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the criteria being recommended by the staff of the City Planning Department would require that the new freeway be located completely underground. The Director replied that the criteria would allow portions of the freeway to be depressed rather than in bored tunnels. Other elements of the proposal such as the Maritime Parkway and the one-way pair on Bay and North Point Streets could be constructed at grade; and he remarked that there was no reason why action on the Maritime Parkway and the one-way pair could not be undertaken immediately. The remaining criteria were merely a statement of the basis on which the City would be willing to negotiate construction of a new freeway if such a route is desired by the State.

Ruth Ricco, 2 Genoa Place, stated that she would support the statements made by Mr. Morzenti.

Lewis Lindsay, representing the Transportation Committee of the Citizens Planning Committee, remarked that demolition of freeways should be less costly than construction of new freeway facilities; and he suggested that first priority should be given to demolition of the elevated Embarcadero Freeway. Furthermore, since a new rapid transit system for the Bay Area is under construction, he doubted that additional facilities for automobiles would be needed in the future.

Rudi Nothenberg, representing Assemblyman Willie Brown, felt that the Commission should determine whether a freeway is needed through the Northern Waterfront before taking action on the criteria for such a freeway. He remarked that the City had already rejected a freeway link between the two bridges; and he felt that the Commission should make it clear that they do not favor such a freeway route before

9/24/70

taking action on the criterion being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had considered the matter carefully and had concluded that traffic improvements are and will continue to be necessary in the Northern Waterfront area. At the present time, traffic conditions are bad throughout the Northern Waterfront; and those traffic problems impair the quality of the environment in the Marin District and the Telegraph Hill Neighborhood. While it would be possible to improve the environment by prohibiting automobile traffic in the area, such an approach would obviously not be realistic. Construction of rapid transit facilities would also help to improve the environment of the neighborhoods in question; and the Commission had previously given its support to rapid transit proposals. However, no single transportation system would provide a complete answer to the problem. The staff of the Department of City Planning felt that construction of a limited capacity freeway through the Northern Waterfront area would help to improve the quality of the environment in the neighborhood; and the staff would not be opposed to the construction of any freeway facility which would meet the criteria being recommended.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he could not support Mr. Nothenberg's suggestion that the Commission should take the position that no freeway should be constructed through the Northern Waterfront area and then proceed to adopt to recommend criteria for such a freeway. Furthermore, he believed that everyone in San Francisco would be in favor of improving traffic conditions in the City.

Mr. Nothenberg stated that he did not object to the criteria which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, he noted that terms of reference often have a tendency to become lost. His concern was that if the Commission were to adopt the criterion recommended, the criteria might alternately be used as an argument for construction of a once discredited freeway.

Commissioner Porter remarked that an infinite number of public hearings would have to be held before any freeway could be constructed in the Northern Waterfront. And the public would have ample opportunities to object to freeway routes which might be proposed by the State. Under the circumstances, she did not understand why Mr. Nothenberg should object to the adoption of general design criteria by the City Planning Commission.

Gina Zimmerman, representing Assemblyman John Burton, suggested that the present public hearing should have been more widely publicized, especially since San Francisco had already rejected numerous freeway proposals; and she hoped that more people would be notified of any future hearings to be held by the City Planning Commission on the subject of freeways.

Commissioner Porter remarked that a number of formal public hearings would have to be held if any specific freeway route were to be recommended for the waterfront area.

9/24/70

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that an additional "whereas clause" should be added to the draft resolution which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning to read as follows:

"WHEREAS, The traffic congestion in the Northern Waterfront Corridor between Downtown San Francisco and the Golden Gate Bridge is harmful to the environment and the livability of the intermediate neighborhoods; and "

He also suggested that another resolve should be added to the draft resolution to read as follows:

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission reaffirms its recommendation that the Bay and North Point Streets one-way system be instituted and that the Maritime Parkway be constructed as soon as possible."

Commissioner Ritchie made the following statement:

"I believe that it is unrealistic at this time to act on the assumption of the demolition of the Embarcadero Freeway and I am also not in favor of the "Waterfront" or shoreline belt free-way and tunnel system to connect 101 and the Golden Gate Bridge. Therefore, I cannot go along on this resolution. There needs to be a more thorough review of alternatives before I will support this resolution."

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried 4-1 that the draft resolution, as amended, be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6632. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Mellon, Porter and Rueda voted "Aye"; Commissioner Ritchie voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting held Monday, September 28, 1970.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Monday, September 28, 1970, at 7:30 P.M. in the auditorium of the Frank McCoppin Elementary School.

PRESENT: Walter S. Newman, President; James J. Finn, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Thomas J. Mellon, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, John Ritchie, and Hector E. Rueda, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director - Plans and Programs; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV - Zoning; Dennis Ryan, Planner III - Urban Design; Trixie Ryan, Planner II; Jack Seto, Planner II; Fritz Mock, Planner II; Emily Hill, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR RESIDENCE -- A PROPOSAL FOR CITIZEN REVIEW.

President Newman welcomed the members of the audience to the Public Hearing. Subsequently, Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reiterated introductory comments which he had made during the Public Hearing on September 14.

William Blackwell, 1216 Montgomery Street, remarked that he had previously appeared before the Commission to present economic, political and social arguments in support of his contention that San Francisco should have a population in excess of one million people. He continued to believe that it would be possible to increase the population of San Francisco and to correct the economic schism between low-income and high-income families without destroying the character and quality of life in San Francisco. He felt that such an objective could be achieved through more effective utilization of land which is already devoted to residential use without requiring further filling of the Bay or use of existing parks. However, he felt that it would be a mistake to commit additional property in San Francisco to park use, as would occur if the new Golden Gate Headlands National Park were to be established. He assured the Commission that the population of San Francisco could be increased without a concurrent increase of pollution of various types; and he indicated that San Francisco should approach the type of density characteristic of Manhattan and Hong Kong. With the use of models which he had prepared, he compared the densities of Manhattan Island, inner London, and central Paris with the type of density which he would propose for San Francisco, remarking that inner London's density of 27,184 people per square mile seemed to him to be an appropriate kind of urban density; and he believed that such density could be achieved in San Francisco without turning San Francisco into a city of high-rise buildings. Nevertheless, he felt that

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...
...the ... of ...

9/28/70

there should be a sharp differentiation between urban and suburban ways of life; and he was convinced that San Francisco's requirements for 25-foot wide lots and for 3,000 square feet of lot area for each single family dwelling tend to create a suburban rather than an urban environment. While the population of San Francisco has decreased, the cost of living and the cost of Government Services have increased markedly in the last 10 years; and, as a result, he believed that there is a need for increased population in San Francisco consisting of middle income people who will be able to share the cost of necessary public services. It seemed to him that the report which had been published by the staff of the Department of City Planning regarded the city as a refuge for poor, minority, and depressed people; and, since the report had not proposed how new jobs might be created, it seemed to him that adoption of the staff proposals would perpetuate a welfare existence for those people with no possible means of escape. He agreed with the report's recommendations for rehabilitation of housing in the city; however, at the same time, he felt that the city itself should be rehabilitated and that the city should take advantage of this opportunity to fulfill its capacity for urban housing.

Commissioner Porter remarked that many people who work in San Francisco prefer to live in suburban communities because more spacious housing is available at lower rates in those communities than in San Francisco. While London and Paris may have achieved high population densities without a need for high rise buildings, she noted that Europeans tend to require less residential floor space than Americans; and she questioned whether the density of San Francisco could be increased as proposed by Mr. Blackwell without the need for high rise buildings. Mr. Blackwell replied that some high rise buildings would probably be needed to achieve the density which he regarded as desirable; however, he emphasized that it would be possible to achieve a high density through construction of three-story townhouses on lots less wide than those presently required in San Francisco.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that Mr. Blackwell's comparison of density of the entire city of San Francisco with the central sections of London and Paris did not seem to him to be fair, particularly since the central areas of those cities do not contain large parks such as Golden Gate Park. A comparison with central San Francisco and central London and central Paris would have seemed more appropriate.

Commissioner Rueda, commenting on the fact that people have moved to the suburbs to obtain large living rooms, dining rooms, swimming pools, and open space, asked how those people could be attracted back to San Francisco if the size of residential lots and the amount of open space in the city were to be reduced. Mr. Blackwell replied that he felt that more amenities could be provided to attract those people back to San Francisco if residential land in the city were used more economically.

William McCabe, representing the Citizens Task Force for a Workable Housing Policy, stated that his committee had tried to emphasize the need for a comprehensive program to improve housing in the city and that it was gratified that an official city agency had at last made an attempt to meet that need. In meeting with the staff of the Department of City Planning, he had remarked on some deficiencies in the report and had recommended that code enforcement programs

should be linked to other programs which were being recommended, such as the receivership program. He remarked that code enforcement, as well as urban renewal, can result in relocation because it encourages increase in rental fees; and he felt that consideration should be given to that fact. He also suggested that increased citizen participation in the planning process should be encouraged since people should be able to decide how their respective communities are to be developed. Yet, he felt that the recommendations which were being made by the staff of the Department of City Planning were extremely favorable as a first step in the right direction; and he urged that those recommendations be supported by the Commission.

James Browne, representing the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council, stated that his organization had been the first neighborhood group to adopt a housing policy; and he felt that the report of the Department of City Planning had incorporated the essential elements of the policy previously adopted by his organization; therefore, he felt that the recommendations of the staff should be supported by the Commission and implemented as soon as possible. At the same time, he suggested that the Commission should become more involved in neighborhood planning, working closely with citizens of various areas of the City.

David White, 25 Lake Street, represented St. Johns Presbyterian Church. He objected to Objective No. 2 of the staff report which would urge increased residential development in certain areas of San Francisco and the Bay Area, particularly since maps which were contained in the report suggested that the greatest increase in density was being proposed in the Richmond district. He believed that an increase in density in the Richmond District would lead to a radical change in the character in the neighborhood; and he did not feel that such a change would necessarily be for the good.

Richard Hunt, 437 37th Avenue, stated that he, also, was concerned with the staff's proposal for increased density in the Richmond District. He remarked that sewers and school facilities are already inadequate in the Richmond District; and he felt that those facilities should be modernized before additional housing is constructed in the neighborhood. He believed that public housing should be dispersed throughout the city, rather than concentrated in huge buildings such as those located on Turk Street; and, in that regard, he felt that a greater effort should be made to lease single-family dwellings for use as public housing units.

Lloyd K. Wake, representing the Family Service Agency, stated that his organization is committed to programs which will provide adequate and sanitary housing within the financial reach of all of the citizens of San Francisco. While he supported the recommendation contained in the staff report to the effect that other communities in the metropolitan area should provide their share of housing for low-income people, he felt that emphasis on that recommendation would provide an opportunity for the city to shrink away from its own responsibility. He felt that the staff proposal for scattered-site public housing should be endorsed. However, in line with the remarks made by one of the previous speakers, he felt that any enforcement program which might result in the dislocation of people should not be undertaken until relocation housing is

9/28/70

available; and, in that regard, he believed that a central relocation service should be established under the direct control of the City. In conclusion, he emphasized the need for greater citizen involvement in the decision-making process.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the remarks that had been made by Mr. Wake had been endorsed by the Board of Directors of his organization. Mr. Wake replied in the affirmative.

Mrs. Renate Livsey, 1738 Union Street, represented the League of Women Voters. She stated that the members of her organization were very enthusiastic about the Improvement Plan for Residence which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and they hoped that the Plan would be adopted and supported by the Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. She stated that her organization supported neighborhood maintenance as the best approach to the problem of housing rehabilitation since it would result in the least amount of relocation. They also supported the code enforcement program and felt that it should be coupled with federal loans and grants and that it should be tied to a rent stabilization program so that people would not be forced to move as a result of rental increases. The members of her organization also supported the proposed receivership program as a means of protecting tenants; and they favored the distribution of public housing throughout the city, especially since integrated neighborhoods would make it easier to integrate the schools. They felt that it was imperative that other communities in the metropolitan area should provide their share of public housing; and, in San Francisco itself, they felt that construction of housing on any surplus public land should be given the first priority.

Kenneth Hunter, Temporary Chairman of the Outer Richmond Association, read a prepared statement as follows:

"The plight of urban America is grave and complex. It has clearly defied simple remedies. Long experience with simple systems has shaped our intuitive short-term responses; however well-motivated, they have been ineffective and even detrimental when applied to such a complex system as an urban city.

"A city should be livable, and primarily geared to the needs of its productive citizens. It should be both vital and stable.

"In particular, two themes running through the "Improvement Plan for Residence" proposal impressed me as being conducive to the deterioration of our city:

- 1-- A pervasive emphasis on providing moderate and low-income housing;
- 2-- A bland acceptance of the premise that San Francisco should encourage an increase in its population.

9/28/70

"I submit that there is already in San Francisco too much low-income housing. If San Francisco needs more of any type of housing, it should be of high- and moderate-high income housing. However, construction of housing in any price class through externally imposed programs may be detrimental to a stagnating city. This is fairly clear if the fundamental problem of the city is too much housing and too high a population, particularly in the lower income groups. Additional housing fills land, and makes new industry (which is what is really needed) even more difficult to initiate.

"The "Improvement Plan" acknowledges that "accommodation of everyone who wants to live and work here (in San Francisco) would harm the very magnets which draw them." The Plan then proceeds to ignore its own warning and encourages the very harm against which it cautions by proposing high density building and the conversion of existing commercial areas into residential building areas.

"Recently, there has been much discussion -- and criticism -- of the Manhattanization of San Francisco. In reading the "Improvement Plan" I find that the areas proposed for "Manhattanization" are not only the downtown, skyscraper area, but also the Richmond District and the Sunset District along its Golden Gate Park border.

"San Francisco is not New York. Golden Gate Park is not Central Park. To turn the residential areas around Golden Gate Park into a facsimile of New York's Central Park residential surroundings seems to me to be both unnecessary and unwise, because of the nature of the surrounding topography and the nature of the area residents.

"Although New York's Fifth Avenue along the Park and its Central Park West are beautiful, behind that wall of expensive apartments, the neighborhoods rapidly drop off into crowded and deteriorated dwellings. Must we succumb to building patterns which have proved detrimental to cities such as New York and Chicago?

"In his recent book, URBAN DYNAMICS, MIT Professor Jay W. Forrester directs considerable attention to the interaction of different types of employment and housing available in a city, and the effect which these have in attracting different kinds of people to the city.

"To remain viable, a city must maintain a balance between the sorts of jobs and housing it offers people. What happens when the Federal, or State, or local government provides the means for a city to build new housing for low income people? Dr. Forrester observes that in the short run, it means an increase in housing and jobs. But over the years both will decline.

9/28/70

"These supposedly progressive and corrective policies attract and overload the city with unskilled people and lead to its inevitable decline. This is what is happening in city after city in America today.

"Dr. Forrester observes that as new low income housing takes over available building sites, it discourages other building in the neighborhood, including housing for skilled workers, higher income tenants, and new business. As job opportunities decline in relation to the increase in unskilled people, unemployment rises, business and skilled people leave in greater numbers, the tax base narrows, the city raises taxes, and more business is driven away. The process of decay steps up.

"Detailed results of the 1970 Census will show exactly what type of persons have fled the city. San Francisco's population loss from 1960 to 1970 has been paralleled in every other urban area of the nation.

"As I see it, San Francisco is already rapidly on a downward path. Already the stable, productive citizenry is being replaced by low income, low skilled people in a dependency status who have little or nothing to offer the future of the city. Already the city has found property taxes an insufficient base for providing governmental services. Already the city fathers are eyeing business income as a convenient tax source. Heavy dependence on business as a tax resource will encourage more business to leave and further hasten the city's decline, leaving primarily the unskilled, unemployed, and the publically dependent.

"Neither Dr. Forrester nor I would agree that a city should have no poor or unskilled people. But as Professor Forrester points out, a city can handle only a given proportion.

"The April, 1970 issue of "Bay Area Facts", published by the San Francisco Bay Area Council, is enlightening. This report demonstrates that already almost 11% of San Francisco's residents are welfare recipients. This is the highest percentage in the nine Bay Area counties. Although San Francisco has only 16% of the population of the Bay Area, it has almost one-fourth of all welfare recipients in the Bay Area. Bay Area Facts indicates "Over all, the Bay Area has proportionately fewer recipients than the rest of the state, though the figures vary considerably from county to county. San Francisco stands out for its considerable concentration in all categories, and especially for the general relief recipients who numbered 11 per 1,000 population."

"This report goes on to point out that "only one of the nine counties (San Francisco) has a higher per capita county expenditure than the Bay Area average -- this is a statistical rarity resulting

1970-1971

1. The following information was obtained from the records of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, regarding the land owned by the United States in the State of California:

9/28/70

from the fact that the per capita welfare expenditure of San Franciscans is 157% greater than the next highest Bay Area county. This high per capita expenditure is attributable to two aid programs: With 16% of the Bay Area population, San Francisco's contribution to boarding homes and institutions (under the aid to families with dependent children program) is equivalent to 49% of the nine county total; its general relief (also referred to as general assistance) expenditure equals 57% of the nine county total."

"San Francisco's \$72,833,543 public cash grant expenditure for fiscal 1968-1969 was the highest of Bay Area counties. Of this, only 40% came from Federal funds, only 35% from State funds, and 25% came from the county budget. Each of these percentages compares very unfavorably with the other Bay Area counties.

"In view of the foregoing statistics and the gloomy prospect which Dr. Forrester holds out for a city which fails to heed the warning contained in such statistics, there may not be much time left for San Francisco to take a hard-nosed attitude that it will discourage additional low income people from moving into the city by refusing to provide them with accommodations. As Dr. Forrester cautions: "If the city has already reached the point where the underemployed are numerous and politically powerful, (his) programs may not be open for practical political consideration."

"As I view it, the City Planning Commission is charged with the task of responsible urban planning which will assure the citizens of the city -- particularly those citizens whose tax dollars have traditionally supported the city, and who contribute in non-monetary ways to its vitality -- that our city will be in 1980 and 1990 and the year 2000 a livable and vital community. The Planning Commission would be remiss in its duties if it adopted or encouraged policies which operated in the opposite direction.

"The number of underemployed people living in a city is not a measure of a city's social value.

"Dr. Forrester points out that "policies that lead to urban revival will give the superficial appearance of favoring upper income groups and industry at the expense of the underemployed. But, these policies will enable the city to perform more efficiently its traditional role of upgrading its existing inhabitants.

"If the preceding seems cruel and unprogressive, I would reply with a final quote from Professor Forrester: "No purpose is served by operating a city so that it is a drain on the economy of the country and a disappointment and frustration to its occupants."

"The statistics indicated in Bay Area Facts show that San Francisco is already seriously out of balance. We must consciously

develop policies which will serve to right the scales, rather than tip them further out of balance.

"I would also commend to your attention, and add our general endorsement to, the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association Report, responding to the Improvement Plan.

"The Improvement Plan anticipates city population increase. The important fact overlooked in this proposal is that during the past decade, the total population dropped 40,000. The middle income and the upper income people that provide the tax base are fleeing the city because they no longer believe they are getting value returned on their tax dollars and because their jobs have been moved to more favorable areas. We are getting more low income people into the city who make heavy demands for public services which further burdens the tax base. San Francisco is losing the people who can really provide a decent revenue and who can handle some of their own problems. But many propose the sort of things like low income housing which will just attract more low income people. The most critical thing is to have an equitable balance between jobs and people who can provide revenue for the tax base. According to the most recent State Department of Welfare report, 85,000 of our 700,000 residents are on some form of welfare. This results in an average of approximately \$150 per person per year for welfare payments alone.

"As for other matters suggested in the Improvement Plan, the policy of neighborhood maintenance, with an emphasis on rehabilitation, is certainly one to be encouraged. Primary attention should be directed to neighborhoods which have not yet become delapidated, rather than the customary practice of dealing with the worst first.

"The Housing Court proposal also seems to be an excellent one, as long as it would respect the right of landlords to expect reasonable conduct from tenants as well as vice versa.

"I would disagree with the League of Women Voters' position presented at your meeting September 14, which urged that repairs made with government subsidized, low interest loans have a requirement that the improved housing not bring higher rents. Certainly a major incentive to improvement of rental property is that the better facilities will command a higher return.

"We certainly welcome the objective of encouraging citizen participation in planning and programming. As you know, citizens groups in the Richmond District will soon be retaining their own community planner, as provided by a grant from the San Francisco Foundation to SPUR, the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association.

"A SPUR neighborhood service office has already been established here in the Richmond, staffed by an advisor who has already rendered

considerable assistance to the Richmond in getting organized for this planning effort, as well as pursuing some of its immediate, short-term goals. Liaison staff from the Department of City Planning has been assigned, and a mutually cordial and productive effort is envisioned.

"We certainly would hope that the Improvement Plan for Residence will not make this considerable effort an academic exercise in the face of decisions already foreclosed."

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt it important to emphasize that San Francisco, unlike other counties in the Bay Area, is both a city and a county with identical boundaries.

Karl Ulrich, representing the housing committee of the American Friends Service Committee, stated that his committee tended to concur with the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City Planning, particularly insofar as those recommendations emphasize maintenance of the housing stock rather than renewal. His committee also favored the recommendation calling for an even distribution of public housing units throughout the city; however, given the number of the people on the waiting list for public housing units at the present time, he felt that the present percentage of public housing units as compared with private housing in the city would have to be increased. His committee felt that the approach which had been taken by the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, calling for a reduction in the population of San Francisco, would create the divisiveness and polarization which would have to be overcome if the character and quality of the city is to be maintained; and he felt that the best thing for people to do at the present time would be to work together in support of the Improvement Plan for Residence which was being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

David Lacey, representing SPEAK, stated that his organization supported most of the policies which were being recommended by the Staff of the Department of City Planning; however, they felt that the Sunset Reservoir site should be maintained as open space instead of being used for housing. With regard to Mr. Blackwell's proposal for increasing the density of San Francisco, he remarked that it may well be true that increased residential density would require a greater public expenditure for services and would thus result in a higher tax rate; and, as a result, he felt that a number of questions would have to be raised and answered before such a policy could be endorsed.

Rudy Nothenberg, representing Assemblyman Willie Brown, indicated that Mr. Brown supported the staff report in a general sense but felt that it should be strengthened in specific instances. Objective 1, Policy 1, calling for the adoption of the neighborhood maintenance approach in the redevelopment program, was commendable; however, he suggested that further consideration should be given to the possibility of establishing smaller rehabilitation districts. He agreed that a moratorium should be established on assessments; however, he was not sure whether the moratorium should be for a period of five years or for

9/28/70

the lifetime of the improvement. With regard to Objective 1, Policy 2, calling for extensive use of code enforcement, Mr. Nothenberg remarked that Mr. Brown would be willing to support the FACE program to the extent that individual neighborhoods desire to take advantage of it. Objective 1, Policy 3, calling for improvement and expansion of services to re-house displaced households, should result in establishment of a central relocation service separate from the Redevelopment Agency. Such a service should probably be located in the Mayor's Office; and it could be used to assist all people in obtaining new housing, not just the people displaced by public programs.

Mr. Nothenburg stated that he and Mr. Brown supported, in a general way, Objective 2, calling for increased residential development in certain areas of San Francisco and the Bay Area; however, they did not feel that existing parks and public open space should be developed for public housing. Objective 3, calling for provision of maximum housing choice both in the city and in the Bay Area, especially for minority and low-income households, seemed to him to be the most essential recommendation proposed in the staff report; and, in that regard, he felt that scattered site public housing would be the best means of achieving that objective. Finally, he agreed and supported Objective No. 5, which called for encouragement of citizen participation in planning and programming public improvements.

Geraldine McGowin Johnson, representing the Central City E.O.C., emphasized that senior citizens are "big business"; and she remarked that there are 125,000 senior citizens living in downtown San Francisco. At the present time, 7,000 people are on the waiting list for public housing; and they are told that there is no more land available in the city for such housing. Yet, every big business which wishes to come to the city seems to find sufficient space to construct a new skyscraper. Under the circumstances, she felt that two new skyscrapers should be constructed for senior citizens, one to be located north of Market Street and the other to be located south of Market Street; and she felt that those buildings should be equipped with a full range of shops and services and that they should have hospitals located on their top floors.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Robert Frank, 823 Shrader Street, stated that he had already submitted written comments on the report to the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that he was in favor of having a housing element adopted for the San Francisco Master Plan; yet, while he was pleased to see that the issue of regional cooperation had been raised in the staff report, he felt that emphasis on that recommendation had led the staff to pay insufficient attention to the provision of state law requiring that local master plans must provide for the housing of all economic strata within the community. He noted that the report had stated that the number of substandard dwelling units in the city ranges from 20,000 and 40,000 units; however, no statement had been made in the report as to how that problem could be solved. Yet, recommendations for solving the problem had been presented in the Community Renewal Report which had previously been prepared by Arthur D. Little, Inc. While the number of dwelling units in San

Francisco has increased significantly since 1945, the population of the city has decreased; nevertheless, the vacancy rate remains essentially the same. Under the circumstances, he felt that it should be apparent that increases and decreases in population are difficult to relate to housing supply. Thus, before reaching a decision as to how many families and how many dwelling units should be provided to accommodate the city, it is essential that a decision should be reached about the type of families which the city wishes to accommodate.

Mr. Frank felt that the proposed housing element of the Master Plan should recognize larger Master Plan issues; and, since the staff was recommending that adequate housing should be made available for all economic segments of the community, he felt that the term "adequate housing" should be defined. He believed that there is a need for residential units with four or five bedrooms in the city; and, in addition, he felt that a central relocation service should be established. While he agreed in principle with the proposal for distributing public housing throughout the city, he felt that no limits should be established on the amount of public housing to be constructed in certain neighborhoods; rather, the location of public housing should be determined by the desires of people who are eligible for such housing. In conclusion, Mr. Frank urged that the objectives and policies for residence being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning be adopted by the City Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, the Redevelopment Agency, and every other agency in the city concerned with provision of housing.

William Holzman, representing the Housing Committee of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that copies of the housing statement which had been prepared by his organization had already been distributed to the members of the Commission; however, he wished to emphasize the necessity of having the housing element of the Master Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors. He stated the SPUR believes that every living soul in the city should be housed decently and that the city should act as a melting pot; however, they believed that the "Melting Pot" should be limited. They felt that the staff of the Department of City Planning had done an excellent job in preparing its draft of a housing element for the Master Plan; and they hoped that it would be adopted and, subsequently, strengthened through increased citizen participation in the planning process.

Bob Covington, representing WAPAC, stated that he believed that every individual in the city should have decent housing. He regarded America as a "Welfare State"; and, because automation has taken jobs away from people, he felt that the real need is for "no-income housing" rather than "low-income housing". While he agreed with the proposal for scattered-site public housing, he felt that the proposal was coming too late since the Western Addition area had already taken on the appearance of World War II with demolished buildings, empty lots and huge public housing complexes. One of the previous speakers had stated that 7,000 people are on the waiting list for public housing units; and he believed that there must be 7,000 black people in addition who need public housing but have not been able to get on the waiting list. Furthermore, the low-income housing which has been constructed in the Redevelopment Project Area A-2 is so poor in quality that he had seen carpenters build better sheds in

9/28/70

which to keep their tools than they were building for human occupancy. In any case, he was in support of the recommendations which were contained in the staff report; and he hoped that Mayor Alioto could be encouraged to endorse the report, also.

Alan Maremont, 2 Seventh Avenue, suggested that additional property in the city should be zoned for family residential use if the Commission wished to achieve the objective of neighborhood maintenance. Large apartment buildings can render areas of the city unattractive for family residential use; and he noted that there are a number of areas in the city where present zoning would allow the construction of large apartment buildings in neighborhoods where they are not now present. Therefore, he felt that the report of the staff of the Department of City Planning should be modified to comment upon the zoning of areas which are characterized as family neighborhoods. Furthermore, while he regarded racial integration as a desirable objective, he felt that the city must seek ways in which to stabilize neighborhoods which are already integrated in order to make open occupancy a reality. In his opinion, the present "color blind" policy simply does not work; and he felt that the state law should be amended to allow discrimination for the purpose of racial integration. He suggested that such a policy should be endorsed by the City Planning Commission and that the Commission should work with local realtors in an effort to achieve truly integrated neighborhoods and to maintain the quality of those neighborhoods.

Arthur Goldman, representing the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Planners, felt that the report which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning constituted a good beginning; and he indicated that his organization had endorsed the report almost completely. He felt that the plan proposed by the staff would be workable; and he only hoped that some of the issues raised in the report could be given more attention in the community.

Stanley Davis, representing the Harbor Light Office of the Salvation Army, stated that the relocation process has been a miserable experience for many residents of the South of Market area; and he felt that everything possible should be done to make the relocation process more comfortable for the people involved. He also suggested that a careful study should be made of low-income people in order to gain an understanding of their similarities, their differences and their desires in terms of housing.

Marguerite Warren remarked that initiation of BART service might raise the possibility of a vast exodus of families to the East Bay since housing can be obtained much less expensively in communities such as Walnut Creek which will be as close to downtown San Francisco in terms of travel time as the Sunset District when BART is in operation. Furthermore, the financing of a new home is much more economical than the rehabilitation of old homes. Under the circumstances, she suggested that the staff of the Department of City Planning should prepare projections of the number of families which might be expected to move out of San Francisco when BART is in operation.

9/28/70

Walter Knox, representing elderly citizens of the central city area, noted that the zoning of the area south of Market Street has not been changed in spite of the fact that businesses are being phased out of the area; and he wondered how long it would be before the Commission would take positive action to rezone the area for residential use and to start construction of dwelling units in the South of Market area.

The Director stated that the existing zoning of the South of Market area does permit construction of dwelling units; and he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had not recommended that the zoning of that neighborhood be changed. In conclusion, he assured the Commission and members of the audience that all of the comments which had been made during the course of the public hearing would be given consideration by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

The first of these is the fact that the Government of the United States has been unable to secure the cooperation of the British Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States. This is due to the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the cooperation of the German Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States.

The second of these is the fact that the Government of the United States has been unable to secure the cooperation of the British Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States. This is due to the fact that the British Government has been unable to secure the cooperation of the German Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States.

With these facts in mind, it is evident that the Government of the United States has been unable to secure the cooperation of the British Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States.

With these facts in mind, it is evident that the Government of the United States has been unable to secure the cooperation of the British Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States.

With these facts in mind, it is evident that the Government of the United States has been unable to secure the cooperation of the British Government in the investigation of the activities of the German Government in the United States.

